

# BACONIANA.

---

VOL. XVII. *Third Series.* JUNE, 1922.

No. 64.

---

It should be clearly understood that the Bacon Society does not hold itself responsible for the views expressed by contributors to "Baconiana."

## FURTHER VINDICATION OF VERULAM.

BY THE HON. SIR JOHN A. COCKBURN, K.C.M.G., M.D.

THERE appears to be a lingering doubt in the minds of some Baconians as to the guiltlessness of Verulam. It is not surprising that he should be condemned by those who imbibe their opinions from Pope's polluted source, or from the foul stream of Macaulay's habitual inaccuracies, with Lord Campbell's unenlightened amplifications. But it is preposterous that those who have learnt to know and venerate the moral grandeur of the high-souled Verulam should for a moment entertain the possibility of such a man accepting bribes to pervert justice. The trouble doubtless arises from a tendency to boggle over the so-called confession of Bacon; for it may be said with some show of reason, how can any one be said to be innocent who has made confession of fault? The answer to this is that everything depends on the standard by which an action is to be judged. Conduct which to-day would be unanimously denounced as corrupt was the recognised practice in the days of Francis Bacon. Judges,

like everybody else from the King downward, were accustomed to accept presents; these were even taken into account in estimating the value of an office. However eager for reform a man participating in public affairs may be it is practically impossible for him suddenly to disturb current usage. Like the dyer's hand his nature is almost subdued to what it works in. Bacon disapproved of many contemporary customs and did his utmost to amend them, but anyone who has practical experience of carrying out reforms in departments of State must be aware that changes to be effective and permanent can only be gradually made. The charges raked up against Bacon chiefly related to proceedings which took place soon after he assumed office, which he could not immediately check even if he had been aware of their existence. When faced with the record of transactions in his own courts he found it impossible according to his own high standard to justify them. On the other hand, had he demanded a formal trial he could readily have exculpated himself according to the standards of the day. Many of the charges brought against him were trivial and untenable; for the presents alluded to were in most cases made after judgment had been given, and therefore were not in those days deemed culpable. Out of 28 accusations there were but two or three gifts which could by any stretch of evidence be said to be *pendente lite*. Verulam in an incredibly short time had cleared up arrears of litigation, and had temporarily removed the reproach of the law's delay. He had pronounced about 7,000 judgments. In such celerity of action some oversights as to the date of receiving a reward might naturally be expected and grave censure could hardly have been visited upon them. Why then did he not carry out his intention of defending himself? It is a sorry story, and may well cause an Englishman to blush. The

only character that comes out with any degree of credit is that of him who endured the shame, and permitted himself to be sacrificed to save others; for if Verulam had been vindicated the favourite must fall, and even the Crown would have been in jeopardy. The country was reeking with corruption under Buckingham's administration. A victim was demanded. The King under promise of restitution to Bacon persuaded him to offer no resistance. Many are of opinion that Bacon showed weakness in consenting to this course. Certainly a less magnanimous mind would not have done so. But it must be remembered that in those days a King was hedged with divinity; and to Bacon, who was loyal to the core, the wish of a monarch was as law. At the time it is probable that he did not realise the advantage that would be taken of his complacency by his enemies, who eagerly seized the opportunity of completely crushing him. His "humble submission and supplication" was rejected by the Lords as insufficient; an explicit answer was demanded to every charge. Verulam had by this time gone too far to retract. He, who had ever maintained that Justice should be above the slightest suspicion of taint, and had invited enquiry into the proceedings of his own Courts, found himself regarded as the warning example of the guilt he abhorred. It is the very irony of fate that the Parliament which was called together by his persuasion should have been the cause of his ruin, and that he himself should have been "the anvil upon which the good effects" which he had so ardently desired were to be "beaten and wrought." It is an abuse of language to stigmatise as corrupt the conduct of a Judge whose awards were free from all suspicion of bribery. None of his judgments were ever reversed. He connived at the term "corruption" because his act of self-sacrifice would



otherwise have been ineffectual ; but while he acknowledged his sentence as salutary for bringing about a reformation in existing practices he never ceased to assert his actual innocence. The whole truth of the case could not, for fear of the authorities, be told at the time in England. The guilt of Bacon was therefore taken for granted here, as by his public confession he intended it to be ; but on the Continent vision was clearer. In 1631 a life of Bacon was published in Paris long before any appeared in England. A translation of this life was made by Mr. Cuningham, and is to be found in BACONIANA, Vol. IV., 3rd series. The treatment meted out to "M. Bacon" is therein described as "monstrous ingratitude and unparalleled cruelty." It is also stated that "Though his probity was entirely exempt from censure, nevertheless he was declared guilty of the crime of his servant." This tallies with the statement of Aubrey that "his servants took bribes ; but his Lordship always gave judgment *secundum æquum et bonum*," and with Bushel's confession, published when the truth was no longer dangerous. Mallet put the matter in a nutshell when he said that Bacon was made the scapegoat of Buckingham. One or the other had to go. The King preferred to keep his favourite, but the world is not now inclined to endorse his choice. The greatest and best of Englishmen left his name and memory in solemn trust to "his own countrymen after some time be passed." The month of May, 1921, witnessed the tercentenary of his sacrifice. Surely 300 years was long enough to wait for vindication.

## ON BI-LITERAL DECIPHERING.

BY HENRY SEYMOUR.

IN the last number of *BACONIANA* was announced a proposal to publish a *facsimile* reproduction of a page of some work believed to contain the biliteral cypher of Francis Bacon. The object of this proposal was to provide some ground upon which a solid judgment might be formed, inasmuch as considerable indecision exists as to the reality or accuracy of the deciphering thereof, which Mrs. Elizabeth Wells Gallup alleges that she has successfully accomplished.

I have been requested by the Editors to prepare a suitable page for illustration, together with some sort of index showing what letters have been distinguished by Mrs. Gallup as belonging to the *a* and *b* founts respectively, in order that their differences may be closely studied and compared, and their consistency established. I have therefore selected a page of letterpress from Bacon's acknowledged work, *The Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh*, which is one of the many books claimed to have been deciphered by Mrs. Gallup\*; and as the cypher is stated to be involved only in the *italics*, of which this page is almost completely composed, there will be a goodly number of letters presented to the view. The *facsimile* has been reduced somewhat so as to conform to the regular size of page in this journal.

Facing the *facsimile* will be found a "key-page" which I have prepared for purposes of reference, and

---

\* See page 136 of *The Bi-Literal Cypher of Francis Bacon*, 3rd edition.

which very clearly shows the disposition of the *a* and *b* fount letters, as indicated by Mrs. Gallup in her deciphering, as also her arrangement of the letters into groups of five, in accordance with Bacon's rule. I have arbitrarily differentiated these letters in the key by Roman and italic forms, simply for motives of convenience ; the former standing for letters of the *a* fount, and the latter for the letters of the *b* fount.

It is important to point out that there were several differing impressions in the original edition of this work, each of which differs in respect only of the peculiar forms of the italic letters. I mentioned in the last issue that I had discovered two of such differing copies, but my attention has since been drawn to the fact that there are still more. In all cases, the general body of the book, in the Roman type, has not been interfered with. This is a very significant circumstance. In the light of a cypher being infolded in these italic letters, and as a means of confounding would-be or undesirable decipherers ; or, again, as a possible measure of economy to impart several different cypher-communications under the cover of a single book, such a circumstance is suggestive, but otherwise seemingly inexplicable. From the printer's point of view there can be no explanation.

The important thing, however, for our readers to know is that the *facsimile* page herein set forth is identical with that employed by Mrs. Gallup in her alleged deciphering ; and although I have never yet been in communication with that lady, I have sufficiently established the fact, I think, that the pages are identical. I may also state that the *facsimile* has been photographed from the 1622 copy of the book in the Bacon Society's library, which I have carefully compared with several other 1622 copies in my possession



In the copy under consideration I find there are 78,537 italic letters. On counting the letters in Mrs. Gallup's deciphered epistle, which by the rule should numerically equal one-fifth of the italic letters in which the cypher is infolded, I find a considerable discrepancy. At the outset, I regarded this as constituting a fatal mechanical flaw, but further investigation showed that Mrs. Gallup employed but 78,120 italic letters of the above total, thereby leaving 417 letters to be otherwise accounted for. I found that the turn-over words or parts of words in italic which occasionally occur *at the foot* of a page, and which are repeated at the commencement of the following page, are not counted and are not involved in the cypher, and quite reasonably ; nor those occurring in the single marginal note on page 154 ; nor those in " Faults Escaped " at the end of the book, together with a few other letters occurring after the cypher signature of Bacon, on the last page ; nor seven letters in as many errors of wrong (and long) grouping (or possibly tricks) which occur throughout the book, minus one letter in an eighth instance of wrong (and *short*) grouping on the *facsimile* page ; all of which, added together, make a total of precisely 417 letters thus accounted for.

In the *Pall Mall Magazine*, of March, 1902, Mrs. Gallup, writing of the immense difficulty she encountered in her deciphering, has this to say :—" The 1623 Folio has the largest variety of letters and irregularities ; but the most difficult work was Bacon's *History of Henry the Seventh*, the mysteries of which it took me the greater part of three months of almost constant study to master. The reason came to light as the work progressed, and will appear from the reading of the first page of the deciphered matter, with its explanations of ' sudden shifts ' to puzzle would-be deci-

pherers." In her transcription itself it is stated that new forms were being devised, and new signs ; one of which being the appearance of a "dot" in or contiguous to a letter which must be regarded to signify a reversal of the power of that letter as to its normal classification, *a* or *b*. This artifice appears to have been first introduced in *Henry the Seventh*, just prior to the publication of the first Shakespeare Folio, whose multiformed letters are frequently conspicuous by such marks.

The scientific problem involved in the deciphering of the biliteral is the accurate analysis and division of the various differences in the forms of the letters, in order that they may be classified into two distinct categories, as *a* and *b*. And, in the absence of instructions, we are bound to fall back upon observation and experiment for its solution. For if each or any of the letters have been invested by the author of the cypher with a variety of forms instead of two only, as appears to be the case, the difficulty of classification will be enlarged, but will not on that account be insuperable. It will simply appear as a more complicated object-lesson in inductive logic. If we examine the characteristic forms of the *b*, as contradistinguished from the *a*, letters in the Capitals of Bacon's own illustrative example of the Bi-formed Alphabet, as set out in *De Augmentis Scientiarum*,\* we see at once that they are mainly distinguishable by their quaint and expanded flourishes, and by

---

\* Archbishop Tenison, in *BACONIANA* (1679) says :—" The fairest and most correct edition of this book in Latine, is that in folio, printed at London, Anno 1623. And whosoever would understand the Lord Bacon's Cypher, let him consult that accurate edition. For, in some other editions which I have perused, the form of the letters of the Alphabet, in which much of the mysterie consisteth, is not observed."



their covering more space than the *a* letters. This is evidently a *kind* of clue or guide in classification, though not the real or only one. Moreover, not a few of Bacon's *a* and *b* letters in the smaller type of the illustrated alphabet are exceedingly alike; while, in his principal example of an infolded cypher message in an exterior epistle from Cicero, many of these small letters are quite different in form from those in his key-alphabet, on whose agreement in form the accuracy of the deciphering professedly depends. Again, in this epistle, many of the smaller letters exhibited as *a* and *b* are so similar in form that a superficial observer would assuredly declare that Bacon had employed them quite indiscriminately!

The late Mrs. Henry Pott was of opinion that in cases where there appeared to be no difference in the forms of letters while they were classified differently, they could generally be determined by their angle of inclination from the common base line. These angles conspicuously vary, to be sure; but what is somewhat perplexing is that, as often as not, a letter has a slanting base of its own, in which case the angular degree is presumably calculated in relation to itself rather than to the regular base-line.

That a great deal is left to the ingenuity of the decipherer in the elucidation of the rules I have long been convinced; and the biliteral cypher, nominally a purely mechanical proposition, is one which demands much mental effort and requires no little patience, skill, wit and imagination to thoroughly comprehend its puzzling ramifications. Possibly, Bacon wished to choose his own readers, and trusted to veiled suggestion rather than to direct instruction, in his illustrations, for his decipherers to follow. To have given plain rules openly during his lifetime for unearthing secrets which he desired to conceal

## King HENRY the Seuenth.

59

*will saue the Bloud in the Citie; nor the Marshalls Sword, that will set this Kingdome in perfect Peace: But that the true way is, to stop the Seeds of Sedition and Rebellion in their beginnings; and for that purpose to deuise, confirme, and quicken good and holesome Lawes, against Riots, and unlawfull Assemblies of People, and all Combinations and Confederacies of them, by Liueries, Tokens, and other Badges of factious Dependance, that the Peace of the Land may by these Ordinances, as by Barres of Iron, bee soundly bound in and strengthened, and all Force both in Court, Countrey, and priuate Houses, be suppress. The care hereof, which so much concerneth your selues, and which the nature of Times doth instantly call for, his Grace commends to your Wisdomes.*

*And because it is the Kings desire, that this Peace, wherein he hopeth to gouerne and maintaine you, doe not beare onely vnto you Leaues, for you to sit vnder the shade of them in safetie; but also should beare you Fruit of Riches, Wealth, and Plentie: Therefore his Grace prays you, to take into consideration matter of Trade, as also the Manufactures of the Kingdome, and to repress the bastard and barren Imployment of Moneyes, to Usurie and unlawfull Exchanges, that they may be (as their natu-*

## BILITERAL KEY PAGE.

\*King theSe venth

wills aveth eBlou dinth eCiti enort he  
 Swo rdtha twill setth isKin gdome inper  
 fectP eaceB uttha tthet ruewa yisto stopt he  
 See dsofS editi onand Rebel lioni nthei rbegi n  
 ning sandf ortha tpurp oseto devis econf irme  
 a ndqui ckeng oodan dhole someL awesa gains t  
 Riot sandu nlawf ullAs sembl iesof Peopl eand†  
 a lCom binat ionsa ndCon feder acies ofthe mby  
 Li verie sToke nsand other Badge soffa ctious s  
 Depe ndanc ethat thePe aceof theLa ndmay  
 bythe seOrd inanc esasb yBarr esofI ronbe e  
 soun dlybo undin andst rengt hneda ndall Forc  
 bothi nCour tCoun treya ndpri vateH ouses  
 besup prest Theca reher eofwh ichso much  
 c oncer nethy ourse lvesa ndwhi chthe natur eof  
 Ti \*mesd othin stant lylal lforh isGra cecom†  
 mends toyou rWisd omes.

A ndbec ausei tisth eKing sdesi retha tthis  
 Peace where inheh opeth togov ernea ndmai n  
 tain eyoud oenot beare onely untoy ouLea ves  
 fo ryout ositu ndert hesha deoft hemin safet ie  
 but alsos hould beare youFr uitof Riche s  
 Weal thand Plent ieThe refor ehisG race  
 p rayes youto takei ntoco nside ratio nmatt erof  
 T radea salso theMa nufac tures ofthe King  
 d omean dtore press etheb astar dandb arren  
 Implo yment ofMon eyest oUsur ieand unlaw  
 fullE xchan gesth atthe ymayb easth eirna tu

\*Omitted letter.

†The capital A in this line is a wrong fount letter, and is probably a printer's error.

‡An error in the text and also a letter omitted in one of the groups in this line.



until after his death would have been egregious folly indeed. The very example of the cypher being put in engraved *script* characters almost tells his readers to look to the *italic* letters in his books for cypher ; for if I mistake not, the original use of italic letters was to imitate handwriting, or script, in print. Italic type was first used by the printer, Aldus Manutius, at Venice, in 1501, in imitation of the cursive hand of the period, and was first used in England by Wynkyn de Worde in 1524. No punctuation marks occur in the alleged cypher, as a matter of course ; and these are supposedly left for the ability of the decipherer to supply, by the ordinary rules of construction.

In order that the reader may translate that portion of the alleged cypher narrative which runs through the *facsimile* page, I append hereunder an illustration of the formula of Bacon's Biliteral Alphabet, the principle of which is that all the common letters of the Alphabet may be resolved into two only, *a* and *b*, which by transposition in five placings give a sufficient number of differences to represent the common alphabet over again. Each separated group of five letters on the key-page therefore represents one letter only of the biliteral alphabet.

aaaaa A	aabaa E	abaaa I	abbaa N	baaaa R	babaa W
aaaab B	aabab F	abaab K	abbab O	baaab S	babab X
aaaba C	aabba G	ababa L	abbba P	baaba T	babba Y
aaabb D	aabbb H	ababb M	abbbb Q	baabb V	babbb Z

The following is a ready-made transcription of the cypher found on the page 59 :—

"—ck, wherein I should looke for many honours, since I was led to think I was borne t' nothing higher. Of a truth, in her gracious moodes, my Royall Mother shewed a certaine pride in me when she named me her little Lo' Keeper ;—but not th' Prince ; never owned that th——"

The last letter *t* on page 58 must be added to the first word *King* on the page 59 to form the first group, by which the biliteral letter *c*, of the word *lack*, is resolved. The last two letters on the page 59, viz., *t* and *u*, are not included in the decoding, as they must be added to the first three letters on the next page to form the succeeding group.

Whilst comparing the differently-formed letters of the *facsimile*, I may call attention to the most conspicuous differences in the few capital letters which happen to appear in the *a* and *b* forms on the page. Note the *C* (*b* fount) on line 1, and compare it with the two *C*'s on line 8 and on line 13 (all *a* fount letters). The most *marked* differences of this letter are contained in the *C* of "Court" and that of "Countrey," on line 13, but these are shewn to belong to the same fount, and do not, as the beginner will be likely to assume, express the distinction between the two fount letters.\* It will therefore behove the investigator to be ever on guard against the obvious. The next significant difference is in the capital letter *A*, on line 7 (*a* fount), and that on line 18 (*b* fount). These two forms are constant. The next, the letter *I* on line 11 (*a* fount) and that on line 27 (*b* fount); these also are constant forms. The *R* on line 4 (*b* fount) may be compared with the same letter on line 7 and on line 22 (*a* fount). The *P* on lines 3, 7, 10, and 19 belong to the *a* fount, while that

---

\* Probably designed to arrest notice, or to call attention to a cypher based on dissimilarly formed letters.

letter on line 23, *which is precisely in the same exterior form*, belongs to the *b* fount. Note that in the classified *a* letters the curve joins the upright stem at the top only, whereas, in the *b* fount letter, the curve joins both at the top and at the centre of the stem. Such slight and unsuspected differences as this will be found to distinguish many other letters which are otherwise much alike in their general configuration ; and these have been found to be consistent throughout the book, except in a small percentage of cases which are probably due to printer's errors. The smaller letters will be far more difficult to discriminate, of necessity ; but as Bacon says :—" He who makes not distinction in small things, makes error in great things."

A peculiar error (or trick of confusion) occurs in the text of the *facsimile* on line 16, which is duly "corrected" in "Faults Escaped" at the end of the book to read—"the nature of the Times." The omission of the article is *apparently* responsible for a hiatus in the cypher, when upon close examination it is found to have nothing whatever to do with it ; yet just here, in the cypher, is an example of a short group, consisting of four letters instead of five. That is to say, if the grouping of letters into fives goes on from this point progressively, as usual, the translation fails to make sense, the first following letter commencing with two *b*'s, as also does the eighteenth letter farther on. Now, no biliteral letter commences with two *b*'s, and this is an excellent guide for the rectification of erroneous grouping in the first instance. And granting the premise that the cypher exists in the text, it is only necessary to make five simple experiments in grouping, at any part of the text, to determine the correctness of the grouping, since it is bound to be one in five, under all circumstances.



By adding an *a* fount letter at the commencement of the short group referred to, the whole difficulty will be cleared away, order will be restored, and the narrative will proceed in a regular manner.

It is significant that a similar instance of "wrong grouping" occurs in Bacon's own cypher example in the Paris edition of *De Augmentis* (1624).

There are, to be sure, several other "errors" throughout the book which require to be closely inspected, carefully considered, and treated in the same practical way.

---

## ANAGRAM SIGNATURES OF FRANCIS BACON.

BY GRANVILLE C. CUNINGHAM.

THE anagram signatures that I have found in many books are sometimes only the name "Francis Bacon" or "Fr. Bacon," but often have added "writ this" or "writ all" or "writ this play" or some such message. The rule that Bacon appears to have laid down and followed in these signatures or messages, is, that the signature or message should be entirely comprised within, and should occupy the *whole* of a complete sentence or verse. That is, that the signature or message should begin upon the first letter in the sentence that begins the signature, and should end upon the last use of the letter in the sentence that ends the signature. The signature or message is formed by taking the first "F," the next "r," the next "a," the next "n," the next "c" and so on, and if the message is simply "Francis Bacon" it should end on the last "n" in the sentence or verse, in the last line. For example :

## 16 Anagram Signatures of Francis Bacon.

Reader, behind this silken **F**ront'spice lies  
The **A**rgument of our Book : which to your eyes  
Our Muse (for serious causes, and best known  
Unto herself) commands should be unshown ;  
And therefore, to that end she hath thought fit  
To draw this **C**urtaine 'twixt your eye and it.\*

This contains the signature "Francis Bacon," beginning on the first " F " in the first line and ending on the last " n " in the last line ; and this rule of the beginning and ending I have adhered to in all the messages I have extracted. The letters used are shown above printed in **black letter**, and in *italics* in the following examples.

But this verse also contains the message "Fr. Bacon writ this," beginning on the first " F " in the first line and ending on the last " s " in the last line :

Reader, behind this silken *F*ront'spice lies  
The Argument of our *B*ook : which to your eyes  
Our Muse (for serious causes, and best known  
Unto herself) *c*ommands should be unshown ;  
And therefore, to that end she hath thought *f*it  
To draw *t*his Curtaine 'twixt your eye and it.

Sometimes the signature or message is written backwards, following the same rule reversed.

I think that Bacon kept this cipher of his entirely to himself. I have searched in many books on cipher-writing of his period, and immediately subsequent to it, and find no hint of it anywhere. He said nothing about it, but trusted entirely to the keen eyes of future examiners to discover it. Had he explained it anywhere, it would immediately have been detected

---

\*From "Argalus and Parthenia," by Francis Quarles. ed. 1656.

in his books and his secret disclosed. In this it differed from the bi-literal. For that he *had* to take the risk of publishing the key (as he did in the "De Augmentis" of 1623 (London) and 1624 (Paris), for without the key it would be absolutely impossible for anyone to make anything of the jumble of bi-formed letters in the italics. But he introduced many difficulties, and gave the key only in Script letters (not in printed), so that searchers might be encountered with great difficulties, and his plan has succeeded "excellently well," as Mrs. Gallup, who performed the immense labour of deciphering, has only been ridiculed by the "learned."

I do not know who was the first person who hit upon this cipher anagram described above. It is found often in the first or last sentence of a work, or in the first or last sentence of the "Dedication" or "Address to the Reader" or in the first or last of the "Author's Preface." Not infrequently it can be found in a "Prologue" or an "Epilogue" or in the "Commendatory Verses" (first or last sentence) that precede some work.

I will give two instances of the Anagram written backwards. The first is in the concluding sentence of "Marlowe's" Edward II., Act V., Sc. 6:

Sweet father, here *unto* thy murdered ghost  
I offer up this wicked traitor's head ;  
And let these tears, distilling from mine eyes,  
Be witness of my *grief* and innocence. "Fr. Bacon."

This begins on the last "f" in the last line, and ends on the first "n" in the first line.

The next is from the first verse of that beautiful song, commencing "His golden locks," attributed to Peele:



## 18 Anagram Signatures of Francis Bacon.

His golden locks time hath to silver turned ;  
 O time too swift, O swiftness never ceasing !  
 His youth gainst time and age hath ever spurned,  
 But spurned in vain ; youth waneth by increasing ;  
 Beauty, strength, youth, are flowers but fading seen ;  
 Duty, faith, love, are roots, and ever green.  
 " Fr. Bacon uurit this song."

This begins on the last "f" in the last line, and ends on the first "g" in the first line. There is here also an interesting use of "uu"—double u, for "w." I have found this in several instances.

The mention of Peele's beautiful song in the foregoing turns one's attention to this writer. I have by me an edition of his works published by A. H. Bullen in 1888, and in this many curious instances of the running signature are to be found. The advantage of this signature is, that it does not in any way depend on the form of the letters, on the printer's art, but whenever the work is correctly re-issued—correctly, so far as the words, and the spelling of them is concerned—the signature is reproduced. This, perhaps, was the reason why Bacon adopted the running signature : whenever his work was reprinted the signature would be reproduced. It would, obviously, be hopeless to expect that the bi-literal cipher would be correctly reproduced in the reprinting of a work.

For instance, in the opening lines of " Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes " (published anonymously in 1599, Peele having died before 1598), we have :

CLAM : " As to the weary wandering wights whom waltering  
 waves environ,  
 No greater joy of joys may be than when from out the ocean  
 They may behold the altitude of billows to abate,  
 For to observe the longitude of seas in former rate,  
 And having then the latitude of searoom for to pass,  
 Their joy is greater, through the grief, than erst before it was.

Taken backwards, the letters following in due order that I have marked, give "Fr. Bacon writ this" beginning on the last "f" of "before" in the last line, and ending on the first "s" of "As" in the first line. It is to be noted that this work was first published anonymously in 1599, after Peele's death: I do not know when it first appeared as having been written by Peele.

There are other very interesting instances of this running signature in the "Tale of Troy."

The "Tale of Troy" was issued as an "Annex" to a Farewell to Sir John Norris and Sir Francis Drake, Knights, and was set out as, "Doone by George Peele, Maister of Artes in Oxforde." At London, Printed by I.C. and are to be solde &c. . . . Anno 1589. In this the work is plainly attributed to "George Peele": there is no anonymity, as was done with the "Sir Clyomon," which came out in 1599.

In 1604 appeared a second edition of "The Tale of Troy": By G. Peele, M. of Arts in Oxford. Printed by A.H. 1604."

Bullen, in Peele's works that I have by me, takes both these editions for the production of the Tale of Troy; sometimes using one, and sometimes the other: but when he uses the 1589 edition he gives the 1604 reading, and *vice versa*: this is very useful.

For instance, for the opening of the Poem, he uses the lines of the 1604 Edition:

"In that world's wounded part, whose waves yet swell  
With everlasting showers of tears that fell,  
And bosom bleeds with great effuse of blood  
That long war shed,—Troy, Neptune's city, stood  
Gorgeously built, like to the House of Fame,  
Or Court of Jove, as some describe the same;  
Under a Prince whom, for his happy state,  
That age surnamed Priam the Fortunate,  
So honoured for his royal progeny,  
Blest in his queen, his offspring, and his country."

## 20 Anagram Signatures of Francis Bacon.

These opening lines first came out in 1604, and differed largely from the opening lines of 1589, that they supplanted. Peele died before 1598. A question naturally arises as to the production of these new lines, after the death of the author who composed the original work, but the answer to that will, I think, automatically appear at the conclusion of the investigation I am engaged on.

Bullen when he adopts these 1604 lines, without troubling himself to enquire how or why they were substituted, gives in a footnote the opening lines of 1589, that he leaves to one side. They are as follows :

“ Whilom in Troy, that ancient noble towne,  
Did dwell a King of honour and renowe,  
Of port, of puisance, and mickle fame,  
And Priam was this mighty prince's name,  
Whom, in regard of his triumphant state,  
The world as then surnamed the fortunate  
So happy was he for his progenie,  
His queene, his court, his children, and countrie.”

Now out of these 1589 lines nothing can be spelled of the running signature ; but in the opening lines that appeared in 1604 there is apparent, according to the letters I have marked, and following properly ; the sentence, “ Francis Bacon writ this song : ” beginning with the first “ f ” that occurs (in the second line) and ending on the last “ g ” in “ offspring ” in the last line of the sentence that ends with a colon. I cannot but think that this is very remarkable.

Again in the concluding sentence of the Poem a very curious piece of handicraft is apparent.

The opening words of this final sentence as given by Bullen are :

“ My author says, to honour Helen's name,”



To this line Bullen has a footnote in which he says :

"To honour Helen's name," is the reading of ed. 1589, Ed., 1604 "in favour of her name."—Bullen prefers the 1589 reading and adopts it in the body of the work, and from an artistic and poetic point of view I think he is right. But the change made in 1604 to the words "in favour of her name," is required to give the running signature. I will print the final lines as they appeared in 1604, and this will be at once apparent :

" My author says, in *favour* of her name,  
That through the world has *been* belied by *fame*,  
How when the king her fere was absent thence,  
(A tale that well may lessen her *offence*),  
Sir Paris took the town by *arms* and *skill*  
And carried Helen *thence* *against* her will  
Whom *whether* afterward she loved or no,  
I cannot tell, but may imagine so."

Following the letters I have marked, we get the sentence : " Fr. Bacon writ all this," beginning on the first " f " in " favour " in the first line, and ending on the last " s " in " so " in the final word in the last line. But without the introduction of the words " in favour of her name " made in 1604 in place of " to honour Helen's name " in the first line, it would be impossible to make any running signature out of the lines as they stood in 1589. Just as the opening lines of the Poem were changed in 1604 so as to give Bacon's signature, so were the closing lines also changed for the same purpose. I think the evidence derived from " The Tale of Troy " is such as to convince the most sceptical that this running signature is a really and truly devised thing and not an imagination.

Another very interesting book is " The Deplorable Life and Death of Edward the Second, King of Eng-

## 22 Anagram Signatures of Francis Bacon.

land " (attributed to Sir Francis Hubert). This is a long poem, in 7 line stanzas, extending to some 600 verses. I possess 4 copies of this. (1st) The MS. from the Phillipp's collection dated 1626. (2nd) The first printed edition dated 1628. (3rd) The second printed edition dated 1629, and (4th) The third printed edition dated 1721. The MS. contains 585 stanzas, the 1628 Ed. 580, the 1629 Ed. 664 and the 1721 Ed. 576. The mere enumeration of these suggests that there is something peculiar about the book.

The title page of the MS. differs from any of the printed editions : is dated 1626, and concludes with " written by . . ." the name being carefully hidden by an elaborate "scrabbling" of the pen. The end of the MS. concludes with "Finis Infortunio," but this word Infortunio is omitted in all the printed editions.

The 1628 edition is entirely anonymous ; no hint is given of the author by initials or otherwise ; but in this edition, three stanzas No. 344 to 346 (numbered the same in the MS.) are left out, a blank space being left in the page for their place, as though the omission had been thought of while the book was in press. The numbers of the stanzas are correctly carried on, to allow for the omission.

The 1629 edition bears on the title page that the work is by "F. H. Knight," and the Epistle (of which there is no counterpart in the MS. or in 1628) is signed "Fran Hubert." The three stanzas omitted in 1628 are here put in by three numbered 386 to 388, that differ entirely from those in the MS.

In the 1721 edition the three omitted stanzas appear in their proper place, and are exactly as in the MS. They relate that the marriages of our Kings with France have always turned out badly :

" Our Henry, Edward, Richard, Seconds all,  
So match't, and found their matches full of Gall."

As at the time the book was brought out, our Charles I. had married Henrietta Maria of France, there was good reason for suppressing these complimentary verses.

Sir Francis Hubert was unknown in literature except for this long and smooth flowing poem. He died in 1629, but whether before his book was "out" or not, I cannot say, but probably before. In the epistle he writes of the book (the 1628 edition) having been "so nakedly, so unworthily, so mangled and so maymed, thrust into the world, that I scarce knew it." Which reminds one instantly of the trick played by Heminge and Condell in their address, "To the great variety of Readers," prefixed to the 1623 Folio, where they endeavour to suggest the reason for the changes in the plays, as therein published, from the extant quartos, that the public by the quartos, "were abused by divers stolen and surreptitious copies, maimed and deformed by frauds and stealths of injurious impostors : " a trick that has deceived the learned commentators even to the present day. I suggest that Sir F. Hubert's Epistle was put in so as to give a reason for the anonymity of the 1628 book, while at the same time providing a person—though dead—for any carping critic to throw stones at, while the real author remains in the background, hidden and unsuspected.

The editor of the 1721 Edition says that, "no small labour has been used to find out the Author," and that Doctor Nicholson in his English Historical Library mentioned King Edward the Second's life being wrote by the Lord Viscount Faulkland, with many political observations on him, and his unhappy favourites Gaveston and the Spencers; he (Dr. Nicholson) continues, "There was also an historical poem written about the same time, on the same subject, whose Author was Richard Hubert, a younger brother of



Sir Henry, who himself made some additional observations, that are of good use and ornament to it."

The editor of the 1721 Edition continues : " Thus far we have helps to put us in a way at least to suppose that this gentleman was the author, Dr. Nicholson indeed says in the above mentioned place, that it was published in Octavo in 1629, but this Edition is so scarce, if at all in being, unless in the Cabinets of the Curious, that no light could be had from it, and the Manuscript from which this Edition is made, mentions nothing relating to the Author."

" But whoever the Author was, the work bespeaks him to have been a gentleman of good sense and Learning, the Philosopher appears thro' the whole both in his morals and his similies from Nature. . . . Thro' the whole, he appears to have been well acquainted with ancient and modern History, and particularly with our own Constitution, to have been an able Statesman, a refined Politician, and a great Scholar."

From which we may learn that, to the Editor of this 1721 Edition, the Author was by no means a certain and definite person, and the description of him, " whosoever the Author was," fits marvellously well to what we know of Francis Bacon. Indeed given this description of an Author living and writing about 1620, one would say that none but Francis Bacon could be intended.

After the long digression let us return to the consideration of the Running Signature as found in " Edward II."

The last stanza (the 580th) of the 1628 Edition is as follows :—

" And heere I pitch the pillars of my paine,  
       Now, Ne plus *ultra* shall my posie be,  
 And thou which hast describ'd my tragick raigne  
 Let this at least give some content to thee,  
 That from disastrous fortunes none are free,

Now take the *worke* out of the Looms again  
And tell *the* world, that all the world *is* vaine."

This gives "Francis Bacon writ this," beginning on the first "f" in of" in the first line, and ending on the last "s" in "is" in the last line. This stanza is identical with the last in the MS.

Now the curious thing is that in the 1629 edition, this stanza appears also as the last, and is *almost* identical, word for word : almost, but not quite, a slight change is made—so slight, that many would read the verse without noticing the change. In 1629 the penultimate line reads :

"Now take thy web out of the Loomes again,"

Here we have "thy web" for "the worke" of 1628. But putting "web" for "work" cuts out the "r" that is required to spell "writ" in the anagram, and when this "r" is lacking, nothing can be spelled out to form the conclusion of the anagram. In other words, without this "r" we can only get "Francis Bacon," and then there follow three lines, with many "n's" in them : showing that "Francis Bacon" does not complete the anagram, while nothing else—(the "r" wanting)—can be made out of the three lines.

But further : The 1629 Edition, that takes the above described liberty with the last Stanza, has prefixed to it an epistle (in prose) to "his very loving brother Mr. Richard Hubert" and an "Author's Preface" in 4 Stanzas. Neither of these have any place or representation in the MS., the 1628 Edition or that of 1721.

The Epistle is—to my mind—one of those cunningly devised writings, full of sly suggestions, that one is accustomed to find in books of this period. We have the "Understanding Reader" alluded to, and the

is nature is important in Shakespeare. In the myth harmony and nature are synonymous. Before the world was created there was only chaos or discord. The warring elements were brought into order by the power of love, resulting in what we call creation. Hermione is an extremely significant name, as it stands equally for Nature and Music. If, therefore, we are to suppose that Perdita stands for the author's poesy, the descent begins well on the mother's side. Posthumous, who "anchors upon Imogen" and desires his *soul* to "hang there like fruit," was born of Leo (Leonatus). Leo is the sun—that is, Apollo—and Apollo was the god of music and the patron of poetry. Perdita was the daughter of Leontes (=Apollo). So that, to take the allegory, she was the offspring of Music and Harmony. Surely a legitimate descent for Poesy.

As the name implies, Perdita is lost. Let us consider the name *Winter's Tale*. What is the *Winter's Tale*? It is simply the story of the lost summer, which in its different aspects constituted the basic myth of the old world. Around it the old mysteries centred. The myth had many variants, but all had to do with the same theme—the changes of the seasons. Men saw the bright summer fade in the gloom of winter and out of this built up the beautiful fables that have come down to us.

All the gods and goddesses are finally resolvable into one "or, at most, two." The "bright gods" stood for summer, the "dark gods" for winter. Together they represent the mysterious duo-unity which we see in Nature and without which nothing could exist. Hence the old formula that "all things come of strife and desire" and the fable of Chaos and Love. We call it variously the Nature Myth, the Creation Myth, the Sun Myth. It is the stem from



which *burgeons* all of mythology. The myriad fables of the gods and goddesses are but the foliation and efflorescence of this central trunk. The myth is protean, as is proper in a nature myth. It pays little attention to "unities" or even to sex. Here and there is some attempt at order, though not very successful or long sustained. Thus we are told that there were twelve gods—Jupiter, Neptunus, Mercurius, Mars, Venus, Diana, Ceres, Minerva, Vesta, Juno, Vulcanus, Apollo. All these, in fact, represent one and the same thing.

The constant confusion of sex and identity which we find in mythology renders hopeless any attempt to introduce order among the gods. Plutarch's essay on Isis and Osiris may serve for illustration. Here the same god appears variously as father, mother, brother, sister, wife and husband. In the "Life of Crassus" Plutarch says: "Here (at Hierapolis) he met with the first ill omen from that goddess whom some call Venus, others Juno, others Nature, or the cause that produces out of moisture the first principles and seeds of all things and gives mankind their earliest knowledge of all that is good for them." In the "Golden Ass of Apuleius" Lucius invokes Isis as "Queen of Heaven, whether thou art the genial Ceres, the prime parent of fruits, who joyous at the discovery of thy daughter didst banish the savage nutriment of the acorn, and pointing out a better food dost now till the Eleusinian soil: or whether thou art the celestial Venus who in the first origin of things didst associate the different sexes through the creation of mutual love and art worshipped in the sea-girt shrine of Paphos: or whether thou art the sister of Phœbus, who by relieving the pangs of women in travail by soothing remedies hast brought into the world multitudes innumerable and art now venerated in the far-famed shrines of

The monument to Spenser was put up in the Abbey some twenty years or so after his death, the work having been executed by Nicholas Stone. A picture of this monument is preserved in an edition of Spenser's work that was brought out in 1679. We thus can see, and know, that the inscription as originally on the stone is exactly as it appears to-day. By the lapse of time the monument became defaced, and was "restored by private subscription in 1778," as we are informed by a notice cut on the base of the present structure. But by comparing with the picture in the 1679 edition we are certified that the inscription on the restored monument, in words, spelling and arrangement of lines is identical with that of the original, except that the dates of birth and death had, in 1778, coolly been changed. The original inscription says, "He was born in London in the Yeare 1510 and died in the Yeare 1596," whereas the Restorers in 1778 say that "he was born in London in the Year 1553 and died in the Year 1598."\* This remarkable discrepancy of dates, I have discussed elsewhere, and will now show the running signature. The epitaph is as follows: "Heare lyes (expecting the second comminge of our Saviour Christ Jesus) the *Body* of Edmond Spenser the Prince of Poets in his Tyme whose Divine Spirit needs noe other witness than the works which he left behind him."

Reading backwards from the last "f" to the first "n," this gives "Fr. Bacon."

The Shakespeare monument was erected in the Abbey in 1740. The figure of the poet is shown holding a scrawl, one hand pointing at the lines written thereon. These lines are as follows: taken from the play "The Tempest," Act IV., Sc. 1. :—

---

\*See "Bacon's Secret Disclosed," [Gay & Hancock, London, 1911.

The Cloud capt Tow'rs,  
 The Gorgeous Palaces,  
 The Solemn Temples,  
 The Great Globe itself,  
 Yea all which it Inherit,  
     Shall Dissolve ;  
 And like the baseless *Fabrick* of a Vision  
 Leave not a wreck behind.

Here reading backwards from the last " f " in " of," to the first " n " in " solemn," we get " Fr. Bacon."

The lines are not quite the same as in the 1623 Folio and modern editions. The Folio has for the 7th line :

" And like this insubstantial pageant faded."

Perhaps the change was made in the epitaph so as to give the " r " in " *fabrick* " required for Fr. Bacon. This monument was put up in 1740. " P. Scheemakers Ft. MDCCXL." is cut on the base. (See note at end).

I submit that these various instances I have brought forward should convince an open and fair-minded reader, that the running signature is a thing actually devised and definitely arranged, and that it is a thing well worth examination and research. I have found and recorded close on one hundred of these, and many more are as yet unrecorded. Students of the literature from 1575 onwards to 1700 will find the search for these signatures a fascinating pastime. Many of the dramas brought out between 1660 and 1700 under pseudonymous names, and sometimes anonymously, have Bacon's secret—or running—signature in them. These are works alluded to by Charles Molloy in his " Address to the Reader " in the Third (1670) Edition of the " *Resuscitatio*," when he says : " Nor shall his



most excellent pieces part of which though dispersed and published at several times in his lifetime, now after his death lie buried in oblivion, but rather survive time, and as incense smell sweet in the nostrils of posterity."

There is much still to be found out about Francis Bacon, and many of his works that have "survived time," have still to be identified as the work of the great master. The running signature we have been investigating will show who is the real author. Molloy's expectation that these works will "smell sweet in the nostrils of posterity" was an idea plainly in Bacon's mind, when he wrote (*Advancement of Learning*, Ed. 1640, p. 334): "As for myself (Excellent King) to speak the truth of myself, I have often wittingly and willingly neglected the glory of mine own Name and Learning (if any such thing be) both in the works I now publish, and in those I contrive for hereafter; whilst I strive to advance the good and profit of mankind."

---

\*NOTE.—The garbled quotation from "The Tempest," used on the Shakespeare Monument, is very noteworthy. The passage in the 1623 Folio, from which the quotation is taken, is as follows:

"These our Actors  
(As I foretold you) were all Spirits, and  
Are melted into Ayre, into thin Ayre,  
And like the baseless fabricke of this vision  
The Cloud-capt Towres, the gorgeous Palaces,  
The Solemne Temples, the great Globe itselfe,  
Yea all which it inherit, shall dissolve,  
And like this insubstantial Pageant faded,  
Leave not a rack behinde."

The transposition of the 4th for the 7th line was done, I feel convinced, in order to give the running signature: and even then we have "a vision" for "this vision."

## MRS. GALLUP'S BI-LITERAL CIPHER.

BY FRANK WOODWARD.

PROBABLY there are but few Baconians, who have given more time, to the Bi-literal Cipher than myself. The Bacon Society were kind enough to let me have one of the three examples of its working, which Mrs. Gallup provided, and I gave a great deal of my spare time to its study. It was taken from the 1622 edition of "The Raigne of King Henry the Seventh."

After many months of work, I found, as Mr. Seymour appears to have done, that the copy I was working on did not agree in the italic letters, with that upon which Mrs. Gallup had worked and from which the example had been taken. On page 18, several words, "Lord," "Duke," "Bedford," etc., being in italics in one printing, and in Roman type in the other. This so discouraged me, that I put the work aside, for some time.

Later, I became personally acquainted with Mrs. Gallup, indeed, I had the pleasure of having her as my guest for three or four months. During this time, the state of her health, prevented her doing any serious work, but she did her best to teach me how to decipher the Bi-literal, but even with her help, I was never able to decipher a complete sentence. I could get 75 to 80 per cent. of the letters correctly classified, but not the remainder, and I had reluctantly to give up the work, on account of the strain it put on my eyesight. Many of the letters are blurred in the printing, or the type is worn, and only the best of sight can detect the differences. Mrs. Gallup com-

menced the work with younger eyes than mine, and also seemed to be able to decide on the font of a letter at a glance. In spite of my failure, I have the utmost faith in the truth of Mrs. Gallup's early work ; of her second book I will speak later.

Putting aside, for the moment, the question of Bacon's royal birth and personal history, on the truth of which Mrs. Gallup's work is usually judged ; in my opinion, the " Argument of the Iliad " which Mrs. Gallup deciphered from the italic letters of the 1628 edition of " The Anatomy of Melancholy " is strong proof of the truth of her entire work.

The italic letters of this 1628 edition, are of a very small type, and the careful examination of each letter, would be most tedious and trying to the eyesight. Consider for a moment, what the work on these 90 or so pages of deciphered matter represents. On each page there are about 32 lines, or 2,880 lines in all. There are, roughly, 40 letters to a line, or, say, 115,200 letters. Each one of these letters stand for five letters of the exterior matter of the Anatomy of Melancholy. Something like 576,000 letters of small italic type would have to be carefully examined and marked as belonging to the A or B founts. Think of the labour involved and the disappointment Mrs. Gallup would have, in finding nothing that threw further light on Bacon's life and works, but only Iliad matter.

I *know* how disappointed she was, but she worked through the whole of this book, always in the hope that it would end, and that something of more interest would be forthcoming, and though it seemed to her like " Love's Labour's Lost," in my opinion, it is an unanswerable proof of the truth, at least, of this portion of her deciphering.

Mrs. Gallup has no knowledge of Greek, and yet she



has produced a translation of the Iliad, which appears to be unlike any other. Take any passage, at hazard, as I have done, and compare it with other translations. There is resemblance but no imitation. Here, for instance, is the first passage my eyes rest upon, it is on page 249 of her book :—

Ah ! Menelaus, then thy houre had come,  
Had not blue-orbed Pallas at thy side  
Repell'd that shaft. Ev'n as a watchfull mother  
Would brush a fly from her faire, sleeping child,

George Chapman's translation, 1611 edition, page 53 :

O Menelaus : but in chiefe, Joves seed the Pillager,  
Stood close before, and slackt the force, the arrow did confer :  
With as much care, and little hurt, As doth a mother use,  
And keepe off from her babe, when sleepe, doth through  
his powers diffuse  
His golden humor : and th'assaults, of rude and busie flies  
She still checks with her carefull hand :

Pope's translation, Book IV., line 158 :

But thee Atrides ! in that dangerous hour  
The gods forget not, nor thy guardian power.  
Pallas assists, and (weaken'd in its force)  
Diverts the weapon from its destin'd course :  
So from her babe, when slumber seals his eye,  
The watchful mother wafts th' envenom'd fly.

William Cowper's translation, 1802 edition, page 113 :

Nor, Menelaus ! Thee the blessed Gods  
Then left, but Pallas, huntress of the spoil,  
Approaching, half suppress'd the cruel shaft.  
Far as a mother wafts the fly aside  
That haunts her slumb'ring babe, she gave its course  
A downward slope &c.

William Sotheby's translation, 1834 edition, page 112 :

But not, O Menelaus, at that hour  
 The Gods from thee withdrew their guardian power :  
 Thee Pallas saved, and on its path of flame  
 Check'd the fell shaft, and turn'd aside its aim,  
 Far as a mother drives the winged pest,  
 That ceaseless hovers o'er her babe at rest :

Ichabod Charles Wright's translation, 1859 edition,

Nor thee did the immortal gods forget,  
 O Menelaus. Pallas, child of Jove,  
 Standing before thee, turned the dart aside,  
 As far as from her boy, when locked in sleep,  
 Fond mother drives away the troublous fly :

Earl of Derby's translation, 1864 edition, page 112 :

Nor, Menelaus, was thy safety then  
 Uncar'd for of the Gods ; Jove's daughter first,  
 Pallas, before thee stood, and turn'd aside  
 The pointed arrow ; turn'd it aside  
 As when a mother from her infant's cheek,  
 Wrapt in sweet slumbers, brushes off a fly ;

Take another passage, in a different part, at random.  
 Here is one, on page 265. This is Mrs. Gallup's  
 version :

Valiant and glorious  
 He was, and strong of heart, yet must he yeeld  
 Unto that hot and fierce repulse, for none,  
 How brave soever, could withstand such force.

The other translations, taken in the same order, are  
 as follows :

Which though their foe were big and strong, and often brake  
 the ring,  
 Forg'd of their lances ; yet (enforc't) he left th'affected  
 prise ;

Stern Thoas, glaring with revengeful eyes,  
 In sullen fury slowly quits the prize.

That though of largest limb and first renown  
For bright achievements, stagg'ring he retired.

Made mighty Thoas to their numbers yield,  
And, girt with all his glory, quit the field.

Brave as he was, gigantic and renowned.

. . . him, though stout,  
And strong, and valiant, kept at bay ; perforce  
He yielded ;

These are all the versions I have access to : possibly, at the British Museum, may be found, some other, with more resemblance, to Mrs. Gallup's deciphered translation, but until such is forthcoming, I shall not lose faith in Mrs. Gallup's work. Those who are of opinion that the deciphered translation is a *réchauffe* of existing translations, would make out Mrs. Gallup to be a greater genius, than I know she claims to be.

The reason why I hesitate to accept all of Mrs. Gallup's later work, published in "The Lost Manuscripts" is that it is so difficult to understand, and the English of the deciphered matter, does not seem equal to the exterior matter. The deciphered matter of her earlier book reads more smoothly and the spelling is better. Take, for instance, the following from "The Lost Manuscripts," page 38, deciphered from Bacon's Essays, 1625.

"Drought will darkle a fount, as my want had made foul  
fayr things—th' long fam'd honor wh'ch redoubles, and  
doubles still, worth, parts, all that men have to give  
them inner co'trol "

Compare this with some of the earlier work, in "The Bi-literal Cypher," any passage will do. Here is one, on page 45, taken from "The Faerie Queene," 1613, edition. Speaking of the Earl of Essex, Bacon says, in cipher :

"Our vayne mother lov'd his bolde manner and free spirit, his sodaine quarrells jealousy in soule o' honour, strength in love. She saw in him her owne spirit in masculine mould, full of youth and beauty."

or even earlier still. The first paragraph in the book of deciphered matter, is taken from Spenser's "Complaints," 1590 and 1591, and is as follows :

"As feares for life are powerfull motives for the adoptio' of secret methodes of inscribing such portions of history as the sovereign chooseth to have shut within the memory, you may not think it strange if you discover here a Ciphe' epistle, but we earnestly beseech and humbly pray you to be the guard to our secret as to your owne."

Mrs. Gallup had had a long illness, during which she was not allowed to do any work, and it was only after some years that her eyesight and strength were sufficiently restored, to let her resume her researches. Probably the general sense of the Cipher message is correctly interpreted, but there may be more mistakes. There is another point not to be overlooked. Most of the Cipher of "The Lost Manuscripts" was put in by Wm. Rawley, who admits his want of skill in its use ; he says : "I have stumblingly proceeded with it (viz., the Cipher) and unwittigly used some letters wro'gly as B, I, L, M, N, P, S, and Z."

Much of the Cipher story cannot be verified, monuments and tombs cannot be opened to see if manuscripts, etc., have been deposited there, but it is fair to add, that on the only occasion that I had of putting the Cipher story of "The Lost Manuscripts" to the test, Mrs. Gallup certainly scored. On page 74 is the following :

"Now to reach rare papers take panell five in F's tower room, slide it under fifty with such force as to gird a spring. Follow A, B, C's therein. Soon will the MSS. so much vaunted, theme o' F's many bookes, be your own."

This is deciphered from "Resuscitacio," 1657, published by Rawley. The Tower referred to is,



probably, "Canonbury Tower," where Bacon lived for some years, but gave up the lease in 1619, and it seemed improbable, that Bacon would leave important papers there, and that Rawley should refer to this hiding place in 1657. Being in London with Mrs. Gallup, we went together to Canonbury Tower, and were shown over it, by the courteous steward of the Club. On entering the principal room, which is lined with oak wainscoting, I pointed out, how impossible it would be to slide No. 5 panel under No. 50, and then went with the steward to see the upper rooms, leaving Mrs. Gallup in the oak room, as, her heart being weak, she preferred not to mount the stairs. On my return, she said, "I think that No. 5 panel *could* slide under No. 50, if the panels are counted as Bacon would have done, on his system of an endless string, the method he uses in his Cipher signatures, and so it was. The panels are arranged as follows

NORTH or Entrance side.									
Upper—49	<u>50</u>	DOOR	51	52	53	54	Upper—	35	EAST
Lower— 6	<u>5</u>		4	3	2	1	Lower—	34	Window
48	7						36	37	38
47	8						32	31	30
Window	9						33	29	28
Window	10						32	27	
Window	11						31		
Window	12						30		
46	13						29		
45	14						28		
Upper—45	15						27		
Lower—44	16						26		
WINDOW	17						25		
40	18						24		
41	19						23		
42	20						22		
43	21						21		
	22						20		
	23						19		
	24						18		
	25						17		
	26						16		
	27						15		
	28						14		
	29						13		
	30						12		
	31						11		
	32						10		
	33						9		
	34						8		
	35						7		
	36						6		
	37						5		
	38						4		
	39						3		
	40						2		
	41						1		
	42								
	43								
	44								
	45								
	46								
	47								
	48								
	49								

On asking the steward, if any secret hiding place had been found, during the recent alterations; he pointed out this very panel, No. 5, as having been loose, and it disclosed a large hole; at the back of which was a wall inclining over towards the room; at such an angle, that the architect thought it advisable to fill the hole up with rubbish. This certainly looks like confirmation of the above extract from "The Lost Manuscripts."

Anyone personally acquainted with Mrs. Gallup would know that she is a lady who would be quite incapable of fraud, and I regret that her life's work has met with such a cool reception from many Baconians.



## DID FRANCIS BACON DIE IN 1626?

BY ALICIA AMY LEITH.

I SUGGEST there are many reasons for believing Francis Bacon did not die in 1626, the first being that Mrs. Pott, the Founder of our Society, did not believe he died then, and that goes far with some of us, myself among the number. Secondly, after much research, I see every reason to agree with her. In an article called "When Did Francis St. Alban Die? Where Was He Buried?" Vol. 2, Third Series, BACONIANA, she writes, speaking of Dr. William Rawley's "Life of Bacon," published 1657: "Any observant reader must be struck with the scantiness of the particulars given concerning the death and burial of his beloved master. . . . No mention of any person who was with him when he died, no one recorded his last words, no one is said to have attended his

funeral, no clergyman is mentioned as having read the service or delivered the customary funeral sermon. . . . Rawley also states calmly and simply 'he' (the name is never again mentioned after the opening words of this Life) was buried in St. Michael's Church, St. Alban's. . . . No pains have been spared in the attempt to discover if this were true . . . suffice it to say I received a most positive assurance from the late Earl Verulam, at Gorhambury, that Francis St. Alban was *not* as had been supposed buried in the vaults of the Church of St. Michael's. This vault was thoroughly examined by himself and a party of experts and every coffin was seen and identified. . . . *Bacon was certainly not buried there.*" Mrs. Pott adds: "There is in the inscription on the Monument at St. Michael's Church nothing which expresses that Francis Bacon was buried in that place . . . but 'thus he sat.' In 1900 a very learned German gentleman wrote . . . 'on such a date four years ago . . . you stated a belief that . . . Bacon did not die in 1626, but that he lived to a very great age. May I ask if you are still of that opinion and your reason?' I wrote repeating my conviction that Francis St. Alban *died only to the world* in 1626. As to later dates I stated a strong suspicion that he was alive and busy revising and writing new and voluminous works on many subjects in 1640—1. In answer came an enthusiastic letter—because an Englishwoman had discovered the 'capital secret'—of Rosicrucianism. The writer then stated as an absolute matter of fact that Francis St. Alban lived to the age of 106 (the age assigned to the Rosicrucian Fathers), and that he died in 1668 in full possession of his senses having for forty years after his supposed death continued to produce a mass of literature. . . ."

Mrs. Pott goes on to note a charming compilation from Bacon, "Thoughts that Breathe and Words that Burn,"

by Dr. Grosart, who calls him "supreme thinker and writer, and artist of cunningest faculty," on page 16 of which is a piece, "Bacon in Retirement, 1629," three years after his supposed death. Mrs. Pott ends her article with these wise words :

"We see how little we as yet know, but it is a step forward when we discover there is something worth knowing, and a step farther when we become convinced we know nothing." Mr. Parker Woodward, in *BACONIANA*, Vol. XIII., Third Series, p. 27, refers to a letter printed for the first time by Montague in his "Life of Bacon," and written to Bacon, dealing with events happening in 1631. And now let us note that the learned German correspondent of Mrs. Pott gave Longevity as the chief secret of the Rosicrucians. That Bacon was a Member of that very secret Brotherhood we prove by his *New Atlantis*. The Rosicrucian Father of the *Journey to the Land of the Rosicrucians*, attributed to Joseph Heydon, is the Tirsan of the New Atlantis ; the Hierusalem or Jerusalem of the one is the Bensalem of the other, and Mr. Wigston in his *Bacon and the Rosicrucians*, gives a number of parallels showing how identical are the authors. A Rosicrucian himself told me that I was to attribute all Bacon's esoteric and secret knowledges to Rosicrucianism rather than to a less learned Society of Brethren.

I have in my possession a most remarkable book called "*Hermippus Redivivus, or the Sage's Triumph over Old Age and the Grave*," printed MDCC.XLI. showing how indubitably the Hermetic Philosophers, among whom are numbered the Rosicrucians, owned the secret of prolonged life. It notes that Roger Bacon the Monk, and Francis Bacon, both studied Longevity, and wrote on it. This curious and interesting book was written by Johann Cohausen, M.D., in Latin, and translated into English in 1748 ; and it alludes no less



than eleven different times to "great Lord Bacon," "wise Lord Bacon," "great Lord Verulam," who, it says, knew personally the wonderful Lady Desmond who lived to one hundred and forty, and changed her teeth three times. (*Vitae & Mortis*.) By the way the same story is in Sir Walter Raleigh's *History of the World*, and is there credited to *Alexander Benedictus*, in other words Francis Bacon. The Lord Chancellor of Nature, as Cowley calls great Bacon, left no branch of Knowledge unexplored, and was the keenest Experimentalist possible, and if he possessed knowledge more than most men he used it in securing the best conditions under which to work for the weal of Man. We know he was immersed in public work under James up to four years before his supposed death, and that he took Seneca for his pattern, who when he was exiled, used his enforced leisure to write Tragedies and other valuable additions to literature. Quiet indeed was needed for Bacon's broken heart and agonised mind; quiet in which to continue his plans for the betterment of man. England, under Charles, was no place for him. Exile and Peace were his only hope. Sixty odd years was no great age for an Experimental Philosopher who wrote again and again of how animals and humans *can* and *do* live to extraordinary old age. Freedom from care, a contemplative life, such as monks and anchorites live, high and holy thought, and rest from the distractions of world, flesh and devil, were among his recipes for long life, and were those I believe he secured in the Castle of Wolfenbüttle, the country seat of Prince Heinrich Julius, Duke of Brunswick, which Bacon tells us was on the Ochre, but which Spedding, with less knowledge, says is on the Oder. This Prince was not only a dramatist but was the Father of the German drama, and the Castle was the birthplace of the German stage,

which produced, with English actors, Bacon's immortal plays. Thomas Hobbes was Francis' Secretary and confidant, and the evidence that his Master died in his arms at Highgate rests entirely on Aubrey's statement, "Hobbes told me so," which hardly meets the situation. When we know that Highgate shares the honour of being the spot where Bacon shuffled off this mortal coil (no bad description of what really happened) with Muswell Hill, the seat of Sir Julius Cæsar \* his uncle by marriage, who is said by one historian to have been sent for to Highgate to his deathbed ; and also that Gorhambury, his Hertfordshire home, is the place which the Historical Commissioners have stated in their report he died in, we are less disposed to believe he died at all ! His birth place and death place alike are shrouded in subterfuge and camouflage as befits the secret man who shrouds himself in mystery for reasons best known to himself. The clue is in our hands when we know him to have been a Rosicrucian, one who preserves his secrets, of which he has many, by every means in his power.

Personally I raked the British Museum in Dr. Garnet's time for evidence of Bacon's death and burial, appealing to him to help me. He turned up for me William Howlett's book on Highgate, and pointed to the footnote that gave as reference *The Lords' Journal* of a certain date, and *The States Calendar* for the silly old story that learned Bacon illuminated the mind of King's physician, Wetherborne, or Wedderburn, by stuffing a dead fowl with snow, and thus accelerated his death, finally brought about by a damp bed in Lord Arundel's empty mansion on Highgate Hill, to which he retired in the *beau milieu* of a country drive ! The story is in every particular so unlikely and childish that it can

---

\*Sir J. Cæsar, the son of a physician, was credited with possessing the secret of Longevity.

only raise a smile and the conviction that Howett wishes to stuff us as he says Bacon stuffed the fowl. However, I looked up the *State's Calendar* and found in a News letter this statement: "Lord St. Alban's died yesterday"; not a word more! As to the *Lords' Journal* the Librarian in the Newspaper Department of the Museum assured me that it had ceased to be issued at the date in question! "Well," said Dr. Garnet, laughing immoderately at sight of my discomfiture, "you can't complain any more of not finding anything about his death, for you have found 'he died yesterday.'"

Dr. Cohausen says, p. 96, of the *Sages Triumph*, "The greatest philosophers and the wisest men of all ages have had this point in view (to live and enjoy life to upwards of a hundred) and have endeavoured to accomplish it," and that "extension of life of such men as Bacon, for instance, is most wanted for the improvement of knowledge, the perfection of mechanical discoveries, and contributing in other respects to the welfare of mankind." And when we read in the *Adv. of Learning* all the wise author says about the Restoration of Youth and Vivacity by diets, bathings, annointings, medicines, and "Intenderation," the true Natural Magic which he finds a knowledge of deficient, and when we see in his *History of Life and Death* what he there says of the Arts' perfection of Prolonging the Life of Man being the thing he *strives* for, the Author of Life and Truth helping him; and how the "beloved Disciple lived longer than any of the rest, and how many of the Fathers, especially the Holy Monks and Hermits, were long lived,"\* it is plain enough that he holds this "for a great good," while he adds "how to attain thereunto is a high and mysterious question."

---

\*The Hermit of St. Anthony lived to 100, as Thomas Lodge tells us in his list of Centenarians. Old Parr lived to be 152, John Bayles to be 130, and Henry Jenkins to 169 years of age, as shown by the Transactions of the Royal Society of London.

A question that our Experimental Philosopher was in no wise likely to leave unsolved !

“ An old complaint, the shortness of Life,” he says in this same treatise ; and again, “ We shall make our judgment upon the things themselves as they give light one to another, and as we can dig Truth out of the mine.”

Let us go and do likewise with regard to the momentous question, *Did Francis Bacon die in 1626?* and unquestionably we shall find that the Truth is *he did not*.

[In connection with the foregoing should be read an extended argument on the same subject by Mr. Granville Cuninghame in *BACONIANA* for July, 1916.—EDRS.]



## SHAKESPEARE AND BACON ON “CUNNING.”

BY R. L. EAGLE.

**D**R. CHARLES CREIGHTON is a free-lance among Shakespeareans and, though opposed to the Baconian authorship, has done much to upset the Stratford myth. His book entitled “ An Allegory of Othello,” published by L. Humphreys in 1912, should be read by every Baconian, for Bacon and his writings are called upon for many illustrations in the course of his interesting interpretation of the play ; indeed, without Bacon, the writing of such a book would have been impossible. According to the doctor, the play is designed upon the religious controversies of the day, and he reads the caste in this light :



Duke	..	..	..	King James
Brabantio	..	..	..	Archibishop Whitgift
Roderigo	..	..	..	John Davies
Iago	..	..	..	Bacon
Othello	..	..	..	Lollardism
Montano	..	..	..	Hooker
Cassio	..	..	..	Sir John Harrington
Desdemona	..	..	..	The Sacrament
Emilia	..	..	..	Queen Elizabeth
Bianca	..	..	..	Barnabe Barnes
The Turks	..	..	..	The Nonconformists.

I do not propose to enter into any discussion as to how much or how little one would agree or disagree with Dr. Creighton's conclusions. What seems particularly interesting is a comparison between Shakespeare's illustration of the working of *cunning* and Bacon's description of how it works. We should bear in mind that "Othello" was performed at Whitehall in 1604 (this being the first record of the play), while the *Essay of Cunning* was not published until 1612. "Othello" remained unpublished until 1622. On page 46 of his book, Dr. Creighton observes :

"The essay "Of Cunning" which is rich in parallels for the artifices of Iago, as well as for Edmund in "King Lear," had a curious history. In the edition of 1625, it is four times as long as in that of 1612, but the opening paragraph of fifteen lines is exactly the same in both, and the closing paragraph is also the same, except that the last three lines of 1612 are transferred in 1625: the whole difference is that an intermediate section of some ninety lines is omitted from the first printing, or interpolated in the second. This is the section which contains the artifices of Iago and Edmund. It consists of

## 46 Shakespeare and Bacon on "Cunning."

eighteen specific points, which are introduced as "the small wares of cunning." Those are the illustrations of the general principles, so that the essay in its originally printed form (1612) was, in a sense, complete without them. Probably the illustrations, being so many as they are, were collected from time to time, and not completed until long after the general principles, two of them being instances from the reign of "the late Queen Elizabeth." Among the Harleian MSS. there is a scrivener's copy of thirty-four essays, the title-page of which describes the author as Solicitor-General, so that it was completed after 1607. It differs from the printed edition of 1612 only in the order, and in omitting the essay "Of Cunning," as well as those "Of Love," and "Of Religion." The essay on Love underwent no changes; that on Religion was much enlarged in 1625 to "Unity in Religion"; and that on Cunning had the extensive middle section of examples interpolated. Whatever was the history of the last in manuscript there are the following similarities between the small wares of cunning and the artifices of Iago and Edmund:—

### ESSAY "OF CUNNING."

It is a point of cunning to wait upon him with whom you wish to speak with your eye.

The *breaking off* in the midst of that one was about to say, as if he took himself up, breeds a greater appetite in him with whom you confer, to know more.

### "OTHELLO."

*Iago*: Wear your eye thus, not jealous nor severe.  
(*Showing him how*).

*Oth.*: And, for I know thou art full of love and honesty,  
And weigh'st thy words before thou giv'st them breath,

Therefore, these *stops of thine* fright me the more:

Such things in a false disloyal knave

Are tricks of custom.

I knew another that when he came to have speech, he would pass over that he intended most; and go forth and come again, and speak of it as a thing that he had almost forgot.

It is a way that some men have, to glance and dart at others by justifying themselves by negatives, as to say, "This I do not."

A sudden, bold, and unexpected question doth many times surprise a man and lay him open.

Some persons procure themselves to be surprised at such times, as it is like the party they work upon will suddenly come upon them, and *to be found with a letter in their hand*, or doing somewhat which they are not accustomed, to the end that they may be opposed of (*i.e.*, questioned upon) those things which of themselves they are desirous to utter.

To these instances detected by Dr. Creighton may be added this parallelism noted by Edwin Reed :

*Oth.* : Leave me, Iago.

*Iago* : My lord, I take my leave.

*Iago* (returning) : My lord, I would I might entreat your honour—

To scan this thing no further. . .

Note if your lady strain his entertainment

With any strong or vehement importunity ;

Much will be seen in that.

*Iago* : It were not for your quiet nor your good,

Nor for my manhood, honesty or wisdom,

To let you know my thoughts.

*Iago* : Did Michael Cassio, when you woo'd my lady,

Know of your love ?

*Oth.* : He did from first to last :

Why dost thou ask ?

This is exactly the artifice of Edmund in " King Lear."

## 48 Shakespeare and Bacon on "Cunning."

There is a cunning which we in England call 'The turning of the Cat in the Pan,' which is when that which a man says to another, he lays it as if another had said it to him.

*(Enter Othello and Iago from a distance.)*

*Emilia* : Madam, here comes my lord.

*Cassio* : Madam, I'll take my leave.

*Des.* : Why, stay, and hear me speak.

*Cas.* : Madam, not now ; I am very ill at ease, unfit for mine own purposes.

*(Exit Cassio.)*

*Iago* : Ha, I like not that.

*Oth.* : What dost thou say ?

*Iago* : Nothing, my lord ; or if—I know not what.

*Oth.* : Was not that Cassio parted from my wife ?

*Iago* : Cassio, my lord ?

No, sure, I cannot think it, That he would steal away so guilty-like,

Seeing you coming.

O ! beware, my lord, of jealousy ;

It is the green-ey'd monster,  
&c.

Iago first incites the feeling of jealousy in his victim, and then, as if surprised and grieved to discover it, utters his warning against it. Mr. Wigston, to whom we owe this splendid parallelism, thus comments upon it : " If we study the whole of this scene where Iago first begins to work upon Othello's mind, we find this exactly illustrated. This caution against jealousy, uttered by Iago, reads as if Othello, and not Iago, had first started the subject, and placed the latter in the position of a friend endeavouring to disabuse a suspicious mind of jealous fancies."

Dr. Creighton quotes Bacon as a preface to his



book, selecting this passage from Bacon's *Preface* to "The Wisdom of the Ancients":

"Many may imagine that I am here entering upon a work of fancy, or amusement, and desiring to use a poetical liberty, in explaining poetical fables. It is true, fables in general are composed of ductile matter, that may be drawn into great variety by a witty talent or an inventive genius, and be delivered of plausible meanings which they never contained . . . And certainly it were very injudicious to suffer the fondness and licentiousness of a few to detract from the honour of allegory and parable in general."

The last paragraph of his book shows the uneasiness in the doctor's mind when it comes to the necessity of "marrying the man" of Stratford "to his verse":

"The proof of symbolism which I have attempted has been made difficult by the infinity and subtlety of the invention, as well as by the all-sufficing beauty of the poetry in its plain meaning. Had Shakespeare been Bacon, we should not have been left in the smallest doubt as to the symbolism of the tale. In Bacon's 'Wisdom of the Ancients,' we have an interesting application of scientific method to elicit the profound meaning of 'poetical fables,' and in the preface to that work an even more interesting statement of the general principles of 'concealed and secret meanings,' and of the indications which proclaim an allegory even afar off."

I think we had better leave it at that!

REVIEW OF  
BACON-SHAKESPEARE-CERVANTES.\*

By

S. A. E. HICKSON, C.B., D.S.O.,  
BRIG.-GENL., R.E. (ret.)

---

CERVANTES-BACON.

THE first part of this book deals with the Bacon-Shakespeare question, having been published two years earlier than Herr Weber's book "Der Wahre Shakespeare," of which a notice has already been published in "Baconiana"; and which goes over much the same ground but more fully. It is proposed now to review Herr Weber's views on the authorship of Don Quixote and other works attributed to Cervantes.

I.

*The Life of Cervantes.*

The first thing that strikes the mind of the close student of the Elizabethan literature,—with which the name of Bacon is becoming ever more closely identified as the great master—is the extraordinary web that seems to have been woven, by means of which, Bacon, as the central figure, is connected up with. even foreign works, where one would the least of all expect to meet his pen. Who, for example, would expect to find the Rose, the Crown, the Harp and the Thistle as emblems,—precisely as they appear in Bacon's

---

\*By Alfred Von Weber-Ebonhof, of the Austrian Shakespeare-Bacon Society.

acknowledged works,—in copies of the Shelton Translation of Don Quixote ;—and even concealed and minute, but unmistakeable figures of Bacon, himself ! Is it possible for any honest literary expert to pass such symbols over without further enquiry ? Nay, human curiosity, on whose power Bacon so greatly calculated, compels a closer examination. Herr Alfred Weber tells us that he was investigating these matters when the war broke out, and he has since added much convincing material to this part of the Bacon controversy.

He admits at the outset that he was induced to pursue the question by the remarkable discovery made in 1910 by Sir E. Durning-Lawrence. This discovery was followed up in an article in *BACONIANA*, June, 1914, by Mr. Hutchinson, who further conceived that Shelton was Bacon himself, and that, what is known as the Shelton Translation, is in truth Bacon's original,<sup>1</sup> from which it was translated into Spanish and published under the name of Cervantes ; the first part appearing in Spanish in 1605, and the second part in 1615.

Herr Weber traces three other works, published under Cervantes' name, to Bacon, namely, the "*Galatea*," which appeared in Spanish in 1584 ; the *Novellas Exemplares*, which appeared in 1612 ; and the *Del el viagodel Parnasso*, published in 1614. The first of these (part in prose, part Eclogues), treats of the proposed marriage of the foremost and most beautiful of shepherdesses (intended for Queen Elizabeth) with a foreign prince (of the French Royal House), and of the political disadvantages to follow from it for England. But beautiful as this is, it

---

<sup>1</sup> A letter of Dudley Carleton of May 11th, 1606, the day after Bacon's wedding, mentions that Don Quixote had already then been translated and sent into the wide world.—Cal. State Papers, Dom. 1606.

was not until the first part of *Don Quixote* appeared in 1605, that Cervantes, who never himself wrote anything of value, awoke to find himself famous ;—though strange to say, widely as this book was read and translated, Cervantes never made anything considerable out of it, and died in indigence and obscurity. (<sup>1</sup>).

His early life was not that of a man of letters, but that of an adventurer and soldier, full of thrilling incidents, and he displayed great bravery and generosity of character. He was baptized on October, 9th, 1547, in Alcala de Henares, where his parents lived at the time of his birth, but moved in 1550 to Barajas, and in 1561 to Madrid. Nothing is known concerning his education. Some verses written by him were published by Juan Lopez de Hoyos, in a collection of poems addressed to the deceased Queen Isabella of Valois, as a contribution in the name of the Professor's pupils ; but there is nothing to show that he ever actually attended any university ; the official lists of matriculation at the universities of Alcala and Salamanca do not contain his name ; and his novels seem only to reveal references to student escapades.

In 1568 Cervantes accompanied the legate Giulio Acquaviva from Spain back to Rome, in what capacity is not clear, but in 1569 he enlisted as a common

1. Smollet, in his *life of Cervantes* prefixed to his 1792 *Translations of Don Quixote*, says :—

“One would imagine pains had been taken to throw a veil of oblivion over the personal concerns of this excellent author. No enquiry hath, as yet been able to ascertain the place of his nativity. . . . No house hath hitherto laid claim to such an illustrious descendant.”

Cervantes is believed to have been born in 1547, and died 1616, so the above was written 176 years after his death.



Spanish soldier in a detachment to assist the Venetians against the Turks. The very commonplace novel *Persiles*, which is undoubtedly his own, shows a high appreciation of the Soldier's career; and this is certain, that he behaved with great valour at the famous battle of Lepanto, where he received two bullet wounds and lost his left hand. He lived for a time in Messina, and in 1575 took ship to return to Spain, but was captured by pirates and imprisoned at Algiers. Amongst many desperate adventures during his imprisonment he hid for a time in 1577, in a cave which a Slave from *Navarre* had dug near the sea at Algiers, and one wonders who this slave was, and how connected in this particular year with *Navarre*! (2). It was not, however, until 1580 that Cervantes was ransomed and returned, at the age of 33 to Madrid, after five years' imprisonment as a slave in Algiers, and twelve years' absence from home and country.

In all this period he had written nothing whatever. He was still a complete soldier at heart, and served in three more campaigns, poverty hanging like a cloud around him. Not literature but slavery, military service and adventure, had been his fate. He had in all probability not given an hour to letters during his absence, and even now displayed no taste for it; but took part in the following year in the war with Portugal. In 1581 he was in Tomar and Carthagená, returning to Madrid in 1585. Not till then did the state of his physique compel him to abandon the soldier's career.

---

2. This incident is not given by Weber. It was in 1577 that young Francis Bacon joined the Embassy of Sir Amyas Paulet in France, and proceeded southwards with it, probably visiting the Court of Navarre, where love-making was the order of the day.

## 54 Review of Bacon-Shakespeare-Cervantes.

Cervantes was now 38 years old, and broken down in health by military privation and his wounds. He was in great need, and seems to have obtained, for a time, the appointment of Tax Collector at Montanchedes, whence he was transferred to the neighbourhood of Madrid, at which place he seems to have indulged in wine and gaming.

There was still no sign in him of any devotion to a high aim, or to study. Yet, strange to relate, the classic *Galatea* had made its appearance under his name in 1584. <sup>(3)</sup>. This work, says Weber, "displays a command of modern and classical languages and extensive reading both in ancient and modern literature, with a startling power over a noble, half-academical, half-aristocratic tongue. The hidden references, and highly artistic and biographical value of this poetical work, are neither known of, nor appreciated to-day," . . . "Who ever reads it will at once see, that he must look elsewhere than to Cervantes as the author of this ravishing poem." How Cervantes obtained it is a mystery. <sup>(4)</sup>.

It was certainly about this time that Cervantes

---

3. 1584 is the year that John Lyley's play of Sappho and Phao was played before the Queen. It deals with the same subject as the *Galatea*, *i.e.*, the Courtship of Queen Elizabeth, by Alençon, Duke of Anjou—her *Grenouille*, the Bottom of Mid'Nights Dream. What could the soldier Cervantes know of this in far-off Spain? (Froude's Hist.)

4. On the 27th June, 1605, shortly after the publication of the first Part of Don Quixote, one Gaspar de Ezpelata, a Navarese gentleman of dissolute habits, was wounded outside the lodging house in which Cervantes and his family lived. He was taken indoors, was nursed by Cervantes' sister, and died on June 29th.—*Encyclo. Britannica*.

In 1584-5, when the "*Galatea*" appeared in Spain, Anthony Bacon was living at Montauban, Navarre.

married, but the idea that the *Galatea* is in any way meant to immortalize his wife, is as far-fetched as to say that Shakespeare or Spenser immortalized Anne Hathaway in the Fairy Queen.

After his marriage, Cervantes appears to have engaged in some business, and various employments between 1587 and 1592, and in 1595 got into trouble, for entrusting a middle-man with a sum of money collected as taxes with which he absconded. As Cervantes could not make good the amount required, which was only 670 francs, sentence was passed against him and he was confined till December 1st, 1597.

He then vainly attempted to make money by the Drama, and after 1598 we lose sight of him. The story that he was imprisoned in 1600 and wrote the 1st part of *Don Quixote* in Argamasilla in the Casa de Medrano is a fable. He was at Valladolid in 1603, and later appears to have resided at Madrid. The appearance of *Don Quixote* does not improve his means of subsistence. He was clearly only like Shakespeare of Stratford, a decoy set up to conceal the real author. "When certain French Cavaliers in the year 1615 enquired as to how and where Cervantes lived, they were merely told that he was an old soldier and poor."

In 1612 the *Novelas Exemplares*, and in 1614 *El viajo al Parnaso* appeared. Both betray the same classic knowledge as the *Galatea*, and in 1615 the 2nd Part of *Don Quixote* was issued. The name of "The voyage to Parnassus," will of itself appeal to English readers acquainted with the English "Pilgrimage to . . . , and Return from Parnassus," acted at Cambridge (and written anonymously) a little earlier (1597 to 1601). The connection between the works attributed to Cervantes, and the author

## 56 Review of Bacon-Shakespeare-Cervantes.

of the Parnassus Plays, receives thereby further confirmation, since "Ingenioso," (5) is one of the principal characters of the English Parnassus Plays, and "El Ingenioso" is the title affixed to *Don Quixote* on the title page (of the Milan edition of 1610).

### EL INGENIOSO HIDALGO.

### DON QUIXOTE DE LA MANCHA.

COMPUESTO POR MIGUEL DE CERVANTES SAAVEDRA.

Cervantes died on April 23rd, 1616, of dropsy. Before his death he wrote a very insignificant novel called *Persiles and Sigismunda*, which cannot for a moment be compared with *Don Quixote* or *Galatea*, but which belongs to an altogether different world. "Neglected during his life,"—says the *Cabinet of Biography* (1835),—"his memory also was unhonoured. His contemporaries gave themselves no trouble to collect and bequeath the circumstances of his life, so that they quickly became involved in obscurity." (6).

It was the same as with Shakespeare in every respect, whereas Bacon appears everywhere as the "Master."

## II

(INTERNAL EVIDENCE IN THE CASE OF *Don Quixote*.)

In dealing with the internal evidence of the true authorship of the four works of Bacon attributed

---

5. Not alluded to by Herr Weber. Part II. only of the English *Return from Parnassus*, was published in 1606, the year after the Spanish Part I. of *Don Quixote* appeared. The two earlier plays appear only to have been published recently from MS. in the Bodleian Library.—See *Pil to Pars. and Retn. from Pars.* W. D. Macray.

An Italian Parnassus had also appeared about 1582.

6. "It was only after about two centuries that the world began to enquire about his cradle and his tomb."



to Cervantes, I will give first a few of the numerous indications instanced by Herr Weber from *Don Quixote*, *Galatea*, and *Novellas*; and then refer to the parallel, which he omits, between the Spanish and the English *Parnassus*.

He draws attention in the first place to the words "Compuesto por," on the title page (page 56), which he explains does not necessarily mean "composed" by, but "put together," by Miguel de Cervantes. This signification is confirmed by the introduction (to the Shelton Original Translation), which, in a passage bearing a double meaning, explains further that Cervantes is not the father (or author) but only the step-father (or pretended author) of *Don Quixote*. The passage in question runs as follows:—

"It oftentimes befalls that a father has a childe both by birth evil-favoured and quite devoid of all perfection and yet the love that he bears him is such that it casts a mark over his eyes, which hinders his discerning of the faults and simplicities thereof . . . But I (though *in show* a father, but in truth but a step-father to *Don Quixote*) will not be borne away by the violent current of the modern *custome* nowadays . . . and thou art in thy own house wherein thou art as absolute a Lord as the King is of his Subsidies, and thou knowest well the common Proverb; that

"Under my Cloak, a Fig for the King." (7)

This last proverb indicates very clearly why so great a shroud or cloak of secrecy has thus been spread over the literature of this period. The method

---

7. Compare Dekker, "the Gull's Handbook." The motley is bought and a coat with 4 elbows' . . . a fig for the new found College of Critics.

## 58 Review of Bacon-Shakespeare-Cervantes.

pursued is very closely the same, for example, in *Don Quixote*; *The Shepherds Calendar*, *The Argenis*; and *La vie comique de Francion* <sup>(8)</sup> published in Paris in 1622 and attributed to Charles Sorel, and other works. Political fear was the order of the day. Thus Weber invites close attention to the Print on the Title page of the Shelton edition. It has a sly-eyed Lynx in the centre surrounded by the usual convolutes, and a small figure of Bacon in the customary hat concealing himself behind a shield in the top left hand corner. "Like Jacques <sup>(9)</sup> in *As you like it* he is ever sighing for a *fool's cloak*, "a motley," behind which to sing unseen to "the infected world" the song of its purification.

Oh, that I were a fool,  
" I am ambitious for a motley coat.

" To blow on whom I please, for so fools have  
" And they that are most galled with my folly,  
" They most must laugh.

(*As you like it.*—Act II., Sc. VII., line 42.) <sup>(10)</sup>

The mad Knight Don Quixote with his spear was a fit motley for the true Shakespeare, and Jacques only expresses in a few words, in Shakespeare's neat way, the whole spirit in which Bacon wrote his feigned histories, under so many pseudonyms, almost

8. Not mentioned by Weber.

9. Jacques is also introduced in the *Return from Parnassus II.*

10. " Invest me in my motley ; give me leave  
To speak my mind, and I will through and through  
Cleanse the foul body of th' infected world  
If they will patiently receive my medicine."

"*As you like it.*"—Act II., Sc. VII., Ln. 58.

all of which are represented in the "Parnassus Plays," i.e., "All kind of Poets referred to certain methodical heads, profitable for the use of these times, to rime upon any occasion a little warning":<sup>(11)</sup> He had just previously referred to them as "*scribimus indocti*,"<sup>(12)</sup> the unlearned scribes used for his devices being such as Cervantes, Shakespeare, Spenser, Barclay, Drayton, Marlowe, Sam Daniells, and others, some mentioned, others not mentioned in the *Parnassus*. He writes concealed behind these names with the sly eye of the Lynx, as the master of a great school touching up and directing like an Aristotle or a Rubens.

Interesting, but only to be briefly mentioned is Weber's translation of the name "Cid Hamet Benengali," who is referred to in the second part of *Don Quixote* as the original author. On page 141 of the Shelton edition *Don Quixote* puts Sancho right, this, saying:—

"Sancho, you are out in the "Moore's surname (not surname) which is, Cid Hamet Benengeli; and Cid in the Arabic *signifieth Lord*."

Moreover Ham is pig, like bacon; and "Ben" is Arabic or Hindustani for "son." Thus the complete name is "Lord Bacon, son (and heir) of England." That this is the meaning intended appears later, where the following conversation occurs, "How should he be a Necromancer, quoth Sancho, for young Carrasco tells me he writes his name Cid Hamet Hen-en-baken?' 'That's an Arabian Name,' reply'd Don Quixote. 'That may very well be,' quoth Sancho, 'for they say your Arabians are great admirers of Hen and Bacon'"—Bacon in the second instance being correctly spelt, and with a capital B.

11. Part I. *Return from Parnassus*. Act I., Sc. I., 204.

12. See Sam Daniells, in "Defence of Rhyme."

Thus Lord Bacon, an Englishman, is the true author of "Don Quixote."

Thus also Weber proceeds to investigate the word Sorbonicoficabilitudinistally which refers numerically to the year 287, the reputed date of the landing in England of St. Alban, the martyr and supposed founder of the Rosicrucian order. The expression "de la Mancha" is explained as the "ruler of the sea"; Armadis de Gaula, the "Donzell of the sea" is the Prince of Wales; that is, again, Bacon in a motley coat, the father of all similar romances. He is also the Herring-King which approaches in nature the "Donzell del Mare," and may be seen on the frontispiece of the *Novum Organum*; the "Proteus" capable of assuming a thousand forms and shapes; "the 'myriad-minded' magician, who, as he himself says of himself so often, never came across any new thought or word, without regarding and studying it in all its relations under all possible aspects, so as to be able to reproduce it as broadly as possible, and spread it as widely as possible." The passage on art in Part II. displays perhaps above all the wisdom of Bacon through the madness of Don Quixote as when he tells us "Art does not exceed nature, but serves to polish and bring it to perfection." (13)

We are thus imperceptibly brought into touch with Ben Jonson's play, *Every man in his humour* in which Cob, when accosted as to his lineage, replies thus:—

13. *Don Quixote*, Part II., Book I., Chap. XVI.

See also *Return from Parnassus*, Part II., Act II., Sc. 3, line 491. "Ingenio pollet cui vim natura negavit."

Happie those which for more commoditie  
And ease, Dulcinea fair! could bring to pass  
That Greenwich where Toboso is, might be  
And London changed, where thy Knights village was.



"Why, sir, an ancient lineage and a princely. Mine ancestry came from a King's belly—no worse man . . . and yet no man either, by your worships' leave, I did lie in that, but herring, the king of Fish (from his belly I proceed), one of the monarchs of the world, I assure you." The initials "C o b" are explained as intended to convey the name of Bacon, in whose secrets Ben Jonson undoubtedly was, with many others.

As inevitably led on in all Baconian literature, we further come across ideas which point towards the *Shepherds Calendar*, in a long discussion on the nature of Glosses, such as the *Calendar* includes, between Don Quixote and Lorenzo (which requires to be dealt with separately), nor must reference be omitted to the mention of Bishop Tenison's dictum that "whoever has the insight to identify himself with Bacon can, like any great critic of painting, discover for himself whether he was the author of this or that work, even if his own name has not been put to it."

Working on this principle, Weber has made a great case for Bacon as author of *Don Quixote*, concluding that the "MAD KNIGHT, THE FOOL IN MOTLEY WITH HIS SPEAR, IS NO OTHER THAN THE GREAT SPEAR-SHAKER, SHAKESPEARE, THAT IS, BACON HIMSELF." In the words of Benengeli (Bacon) in the last scene of *Don Quixote*, we are plainly told so:—"He and I are the self-same person," the great myriad-minded Master.'

Amongst his other most convincing proofs are the startling quotations of verses from the Shelton edition, e.g.,

The Princess Oriana of Great Britain to Lady  
Dulcinea del Toboso:—

67

(To be concluded.)

## "A CYPHER WITHIN A CYPHER."

BY WILFRID GUNDRY.

"**A** CYPHER Within a Cypher" is the title of a pamphlet by that pertinacious investigator, Mr. Henry Seymour, whose enthusiasm has made him a missionary in many fields, and who never wearies in and out of season in pressing the claims of the Bacon Bi-literal cypher by all legitimate forms of propaganda.

The Bi-literal cypher discoveries of Mrs. Gallup have never been explained away by her critics, but on the contrary as investigation proceeds into the history, open and concealed of the period, many facts have been brought to light which tend to confirm its existence, and the truth of the facts which it is alleged, by believers in it, to convey. Mr. Seymour has brought to bear on this important division of Baconian labours a mental equipment peculiarly adapted to this field of research, for not only is he gifted with a quick eye and logical mind, but he has had the necessary training which makes him an adept in the freemasonry of printing.

The pamphlet in question traces the origin of the cypher and its gradual development. Mr. Seymour is at pains to show what Bacon owes to his predecessor, Colonna, in his cypher work. The latter wrote in the thirteenth century.

The lynx-eyed author has discovered in the script examples in the 1623 "De Augmentis Scientiarum" an anagram signature, "William Shakespeare," which had escaped that able decipherer, Mrs. Gallup, but he is careful to say that this fact in no way invalidates

the claim which the latter makes that a cypher message runs through Bacon's acknowledged works, Shakespeare's plays, and many other printed works of the period.

This discovery does not refute the assertion by the gifted American writer that no part of the cypher story is embodied in the script or pen-letters used for purposes of illustrating the mechanism of the Bi-literal cypher in the “ De Augmentis Scientiarum,” as no message but only an anagram on the name, “ William Shakespeare,” has been discovered by him.

The author sounds a note of warning when he explains the complex nature, and the gradual evolution of forms, with a view to eluding the vigilance of Bacon's enemies, and in order to prevent premature discovery.

He shows that there has been a transition of letter-forms, and that misleading modifications have been introduced for the purpose of greater concealment.

The key printed in the “ De Augmentis Scientiarum ” is in script letters, but the cypher is only printed either in italics or in Roman letters.

Mr. Seymour states his belief that the Bi-literal cypher “ is a valuable object lesson in the principles of the inductive method,” and asserts that it was never intended as a purely mechanical device that could be comprehended by any dunce. We might well make use of one of the terms of Einstein in considering the method of deciphering advocated by the writer, and describe the process as one of letter-form-relativity-recognition. When considering the development and evolution of the letter-forms we might apply the words of Bacon himself written in another connection. “ I ever alter as I add and nothing is finished till all is finished.”

A *facsimile* of the key to the Bi-literal cypher as given by Bacon in his De Augmentis Scientiarum of 1623

is published with this work, and does much to explain the cypher system under discussion.

The purchase and careful perusal of this pamphlet is confidently recommended to all genuine searchers after *truth*.

14th April, 1922.

---



## BACONIAN FLOTSAM.

BY PARKER WOODWARD.

LABEO.

HALL, an expert young Cambridge Fellow, printed in 1597 some "Satires." In Book 2, Satire 1, he began :—

" For shame write better Labeo or write none.  
Or better write ; or Labeo write alone."

The satire goes on to imply that Labeo had been engaged in much writing :—

" With folio volumes two to an oxe hide,  
Or else ye pamphleteer go stand aside."

In 1598 Marston replied to Hall :—

" Fond censurer ! Why should those mirrors seeme  
So vile to thee which better judgments deeme  
Exquisite, then, &c.

\* \* \* \*

What not *mediocria firma* from thy spight ?

In 1598 Hall rejoined with Satire 1, Book IX. :—

" Labeo is whipt and laughs mee in the face."

\* \* \* \*

" Who list complaine of wronged faith or fame  
When he may shift it to another's name."

These references are discussed more fully in " Is it

Shakespeare," by the late Rev. W. Begley, and in  
 "Bacon Cryptograms," by the late I. H. Platt.

But they had not remarked upon what appears  
 to be apologetical in Hall's 6th Book, Satire 1 :—

" Tho Labeo reaches right (who can deny ?)  
 The true strains of heroic poesy ;

\* \* \* \*

" He can implore the heathen deities  
 To guide his bold and busy enterprise  
 Or filch whole pages at a clap for need  
 From honest Petrarch clad in English weed."

\* \* \* \*

" Lastly he names the spirit of Astrophel  
 Now hath not Labeo done wondrous well !  
 But ere his Muse her weapon learn to wield  
 Or dance a sober Pirrhicke in the field ;  
 Or marching, wade in blood up to the knees,  
 Her Arma Virum goes by two degrees.  
 The sheep cote first hath been her nursery."

\* \* \* \* &c.

" And winded still a pipe of oate or brere

\* \* \* \* &c.

Or else hath beene in Venus chamber trained  
 To play with Cupid till she had attained  
 To comment well upon a beauteous face  
 Then was she fit for an heroic place."

A Labeo of Roman History flourished about B.C. 42 to A.D. 17. He was a lawyer and wrote numerous books. The appellation Labeo would therefore well fit Bacon, whose motto was "Mediocria Firma." He (Bacon) wrote the "Shepherds Kalendar," the "Spenser" poems ; took part in pamphleteering ; wrote "Venus and Adonis," the "Tears of the Muses," and "Astrophel and Stella." Moreover, he was keen upon introducing books from the Continent, Whitney's Emblems being one. Thus it is fairly evident that by 1598 Hall knew of certain extensive literary work

Bacon had accomplished. Whether he also knew of Bacon's dramatic writings is not very evident, but it must be borne in mind that the name "Shakespeare" was not title-paged to any printed play until 1598, which would doubtless be after Hall's book had been published.

One may conclude that Bacon's extensive, but concealed authorship was known in certain literary circles. It may be coincidence that the value of the letters in "Labeo" and in "Bacon" are the same, viz., 33.

#### BEN JONSON.

This poet wrote a good deal of rough, but quite good poetry and drama. We may judge from his preface to "Sejanus" (apart from the statement in biliteral cipher) that Bacon did a good deal of the writing ascribed to Jonson and the two would appear to have collaborated. Jonson's surname was correctly spelt "Johnson." His children were registered in the surname "Johnson," and the surname is so written in "Henslowe's Diary."

#### JAMES MAB.

This scholar took his B.A. at Oxford in 1594. He contributed a commendatory verse to Florio's "World of Worlds," 1611. During 1611-13 he was in Madrid with the English Ambassador, Sir John Digby.

The commendatory verse signed "J. M." to the Shakespeare Folio Plays, 1623, is attributed to him. He spelt his name "Mab," like the other members of his family. But in 1623 he is title-paged as James Mabbe, as the translator of a book by Gusman de Alfarache, from the Spanish. There his name is printed as "Don Diego Puede: Ser" "James may be."

It is also rendered in the same Spanish words

as the supposed translator of "Novelas Exemplaires," from the title-paged author, "Cervantes."

A query arises whether Mab was one of those "good pens who desert me not," men who allowed Francis Bacon to use their names as well as their services. Publication in other names was one of the rules of the secret fraternity of the Rosicrosse. The numerical value of the letters in the extended name "James Mabbe," in the Elizabethan alphabet is 67, equal to the value of the letters in "Francis." The extra B sound would suggest Francis B. So it looks like one of Bacon's little tricks of partial disclosure of authorship. "Mab" probably contributed the valedictory verse signed "James" to the "Manes Verulamiani," one of the 33 testimonials to Bacon when supposed to be dead in 1626.

#### A "SHAKESPEARE" PORTRAIT.

The *Illustrated London News*, of October, 1920, prints a photograph of a woodcut portrait of "Shakespeare," and of the title page of "an extremely rare, if not unknown print" of the second or 1640 edition of the Shakespeare Poems, the first edition having been published in 1609, entitled "Shakespeare's Sonnets."

The woodcut portrait above mentioned seems to be a first attempt by Marshall to reproduce something of the Droeshout "portrait" of "Shakespeare," prefixed to the 1623 Folio Plays, putting the Droeshout head upon a different bust. The Marshall woodcut gives a better indication than the Droeshout of another figure with back to the reader at the rear of the portrait. Under the "portrait" there is one italic letter in the first line and thirty-two in the second line = 33 the numerical value of the letters in "Bacon." The total of the letters under the "portrait" is 81.



Above the printer's mark on the title page are thirty-three letters. This was accomplished by using two V's instead of a W, and omitting the second L from the name Will, so that it reads "VVil Shake-speare."

The total of the letters under the printer's ornament is 81.

The publishers of the 1640 poems may have considered the first letterings below the wood-cut and on the title-page to have been too easy of decipherment. So the final state of the edition merely gives 282 italic letters under a further altered portrait. 282 is the total value of the letters in "Francis Bacon" in K. cipher which cipher had of course to be mastered before its meaning could be obtained. I am sorry to trouble readers with "numbers" because I have also to refer to the letters in the verse "to the reader" on the first page of the Shakespeare Folio 1623, which counted carefully give a total of 287.

This is the total in K cipher of the numerical value of the letters in "Fra Rosicrosse." From the "Shakespeare Poems 1640" several sonnets were omitted. Their number in the 1609 edition added together total 287.

This may have been a secret way of intimating that Francis Bacon, brother of the secret Fraternity of the Rosicrosse, was then dead, or merely that it was a Rosicrosse publication.

Every member of the fraternity who published a book appears to have indicated his membership by a count of 287 letters or words or both in either the vestibule or at the end of his book.

81 is the simple count of the letters in "Messias" or Leader. Or it may represent Ch. (Christian) Rosen C (Cruetz.)

81 is the total of the italic letters beneath the portrait of Bacon in the 1657, 1661 and 1671 editions

of the "Resuscitatio" and in the 1638 edition of certain of his works translated into Latin the same number (81) is indicated by italic letters under Bacon's prefixed portrait.

It is also indicated under Bacon's new portrait in the 1640 "Advancement of Learning," being the value of the italic capitals J. J. D. J. V. P. and P. 56 is the total of the letters above the "Shakespeare" Statue in Westminster Abbey. This is an indication of Fr. Bacon 23-33 while the incorrect quotation from the "Tempest" which is on the scroll held by the Statue, totals 157 which means "Fra Rosicrosse" in simple count. 56 is also the total of the words on the two first pages of the "rare print of the Shakespeare Poems 1640" already mentioned.

#### GRAYS INN HALL.

One wonders how many Baconians have taken the trouble to visit this Hall. They would be rewarded by seeing Queen Elizabeth's fine portrait in oils above the Bencher's table and another fine portrait of Francis Bacon. Notice the colouring of the hair in the two pictures.

Bacon was, of course, a member of the Inn and had much to do with its garden, and delivered Lectures on Law to its students. I am disposed to assume that to his instigation has been the drinking at Grays Inn Hall four times in every year of the following toast:—

"To the glorious and pious memory of Her late Majesty Queen Elizabeth."

#### THE TOWER OF LONDON.

A custodian of this fortress and royal palace recently published some account of it. But, in referring to prisoners of note who had suffered the extreme penalty in its precincts, omitted mention of Robert, 2nd Earl

of Essex, executed in 1601 on Tower Green. Nor did he mention the name "Robart Tidir" (Tudor) cut in large letters in the wall of a cell at foot of the Beauchamp Tower.

On attention being drawn to the omission he replied that "he did not think it fair to revive an ancient scandal about Queen Elizabeth."

That raises the question as to when a scandal ceases to be such and becomes a historical fact? Elizabeth was a remarkable Queen, and surely at a distance of over three hundred years the truths about her can be discussed and judged at their relevant unimportance.

That was manifestly Francis Bacon's view. In the pamphlet he printed in happy memory of her he said: "To say truth, the best commender of this lady's virtues is time."

#### THE MUMMER.

Mr. George Moore has given this very excellent name to the deserving man-player of Stratford-on-Avon whose sale to Francis Bacon of the use of his name for conversion to a poetised form, has illuded so many persons even to the present day.

Indexed on the cover of the Northumberland House M.S. are certain works of Francis Bacon and contents now missing indexed as "Richard II" and "Richard III."

Plays bearing those titles were printed anonymously in the year 1597. Early in the year 1597-8, Sir Robert Cecil and Sir Walter Raleigh being in France, Robert, Earl of Essex gave a grand entertainment to a large company of his adherents at Essex House. Two plays were there performed. In 1598 the plays of "Richard II" and "Richard III" were republished and on their title pages the name "William Shakespeare" made a first appearance as dramatic author.

In the same year on page 282 (Bacon's name number in K cipher) of "Palladis Tamia" Meres made a wholesale attribution of plays and poems to the Mummer's authorship.

Also in the same year the Mummer retired to and remained in the remote obscurity of his native hamlet evidently possessed of considerable wealth. From this village he does not appear to have re-emerged until after the death of Queen Elizabeth in 1603.

Rowe, who was Royal poet laureate in 1706, has given important numerical evidence that he was a brother of the secret fraternity of Rosicrosse. To a collection of "Shakespeare" plays he prefixed a sort of "Life" of the "Mummer" from which we can glean two interesting statements:—

1. "That my lord Southampton at one time gave him (the Mummer) a thousand pounds to enable him to go through with a purchase which he heard he had a mind to."

Earl Southampton was a rich young lord at that time, studying with Francis Bacon at Grays Inn.

2. That the top of his (the Mummer's) performance was that of "the Ghost in his own Hamlet."

Substitute small letters for the capitals "G" and "H" and we can gather the interesting fact that, arising out of the Queen's wrath over the play of "Richard II", which she considered an attack upon her personally (as her cousin Lord Hunsden used to call her Richard II), the plays were quickly saddled upon the Mummer as author, the consideration being a substantial amount provided by Bacon's wealthy friend, the Earl of Southampton, for which the Mummer packed off to personate (as ghost) the real author in the remoteness of his own little *hamlet* until after the Queen's death.



## ALLUSION BOOKS (INGLEBY).

Vol. I, page 422, mentions Don Quijote Parte ii 1615 as having traces of "As you like it" and "Macbeth." The reason why may be made more apparent some day.

Vol. II page 87 gives the printer's Preface to the first Quarto of "Othello," published 1622.

In the 1623 Shakespeare Plays, "Othello" is extended from its Quarto state by 160 new lines and has other emendations.

It is interesting to note that the Preface to the Quarto mentioned has exactly 100 words indicating Francis 67 and Bacon 33, as the author of the preface.

No other quarto was printed until 1630. To this 1630 quarto the 160 new lines from the Folio version of the play were added and other emendations made.

The title page of this 1630 quarto exhibits the Fra Rosecrosse numerical sign 287 viz., letters 236—words 51, so it is evident that a member or members of Bacon's secret literary fraternity supervised its publication.

Vol. 2 page 176 of Ingleby's Allusion Book gives Archer's 1656 "exact and perfect Catalogue of all the Playes that ever were printed together with the Author's names." This catalogue and others give Will Shakespeare as author of "Arraignement of Paris" first printed anonymously in 1584. Francis by that date had written other plays. The Mummer was still at Stratford.

Francis writing as "Nash" in Menaphon 1589 fathered the play on Peele who was probably associated with its performance. But the old cataloguers seem to have known better.

They were not aware of the miracle they were asking their readers to believe if they were really suggesting the Mummer's authorship!

## REVIEW OF THE "TRUE SHAKESPEARE."

## A FEW COMMENTS.

I differ from the reviewer (in a previous number of this magazine) in that I regard the De Quadra letters to the King of Spain as the honest record of an acute observer who correctly sensed the actual relationship of the Queen to Lord Robert Dudley. We may attribute to dynastic reasons the circumstance that the truth about Francis Bacon was not disclosed after 100 years from his death. Not only was the Stuart Pretender alive and active but there was then living a direct descendant of Robert Earl of Essex, which Earl, with a great deal of probability, is alleged to have been a legitimate son of the Queen and her husband Dudley, afterwards Earl of Leicester. Active in the movement for postponement of disclosure were Earls Oxford (Harley), Burlington, and Orford (Walpole), Archbishop Tenison, Dugdale head of the Heralds College, Stephens the Royal Historiographer, Mead, the Royal physician who was Vice-President of the Royal Society and the chief authority on Bacon's works, and Rowe the Royal Poet Laureate.

Alexander Pope, too, was concerned. He was a member of the Rosicrosse fraternity and jealous of Bacon, though alive to his wonderful and unique genius. Pope was most influential in Court circles. Walpole was the Prime Minister who suggested the Welbeck miniature head for the Shakespeare effigy in Pope's edition of "Shakespeare."

## SHAKESPEARE IDENTIFIED.

Mr. Looney, the author of this book, has made an initial error in not contemplating the almost positive fact that Francis Bacon masked himself as "Lyllie." In 1576, the Chapel children played for Court entertainment a "Historie of Errors"; which was likely

to have been young Bacon's first written play. Revised, it appeared as the Shakespeare "Comedy of Errors." W. L. Rushton has pointed out many remarkable identities between "Lillie" and "Shakespeare." This masking came about as follows:— In or before 1578 Francis, while in France, wrote "Euphues Anatomy of Wit," which he said he "entrusted to a nobleman to nurse." May we say "get printed." It appears to have been registered without author's name. Almost immediately afterwards another printing was registered as by John Lyllie. The nobleman Francis referred to, would probably have been the Earl of Oxenford (married to Burleigh's daughter) but when an author's name was required for "Euphues" that of John Lyly, a dependent of Burleigh, was made use of. It is clear the true author did *not* wish to be known for he said, "He that cometh into print because he would be known, is like the foole that cometh into the market because he would be seene."

Trouble, however, arose through the use of the Lilley mask because the man Lyly was at Oxford University (of which Earl Leicester was Chancellor), and "Euphues" in his book had attacked this University amongst others.

So "Euphues," writing in a preface to "Euphues his England" (being Euphues 2nd part) printed in 1580 apologised to the Oxford scholars:—

"If anie fault be committed impute it to Euphues who know you not, not to Lyly who hate you not." In October, 1580, Francis was ordered to study law at Gray's Inn and protested to Burleigh that it was unfair for one well off or friended to be put to study common laws instead of studies of *greater delight than law*.

This difficulty was adjusted, the Queen (his unacknowledged mother) appointing Francis to her

service and making provision for his maintenance. Lyly, the mask, Mr. Warwick Bond thinks, was private secretary to the Earl of Oxford.

This view is probably a mistake due to the fact that Francis dedicated "Euphues 2nd part" (printed in 1580) to the Earl of Oxenforde as "my verie good Lorde *and Maister.*"

The work Francis was put to do was evidently (as subsequent letters to the Queen show) the writing of plays for performance by the boyes of the Queen's chapel, at Court Entertainments. These Court performances were under the control of Earl Oxenford as hereditary Lord Great Chamberlain. Francis in 1580 was not of age and accordingly subject to the Earl's orders. After he was 21, in dedicating as "Watson," a book of verse to Earl Oxenford, Francis omitted the words "and maister."

All the so-called Court comedies printed before 1597 had no author's name. In 1597 two or three other comedies were title-paged to "John Lillie" as author of same.

"Agamemnon and Ulysses," enacted before the Queen by the "Earle of Oxenforde his boyes" in 1584, was doubtless, as Mr. Looney thinks, turned into a Shakespeare play "Troylus and Cresseid," a quarto of which was printed in January 1608-9.

In 1632, Blount (publisher of the Shakespeare Folio) printed six of the "Lyllie" plays as "Six Court Comedies." The remarkable fact that over a score of lyrics missing from the quartos were restored in the 1632 publication led Mr. Looney to infer that they had been supplied by some relative of the Earl of Oxford, that Earl himself having died 28 years before.

If, as I am satisfied, Bacon had written the Comedies it was very natural that he should have still possessed the lyrics, and as he did not die in 1626 but was alive



abroad later than 1631 he would have been the active mover in getting the collected edition printed in 1632. This year a certain French avocat named Ælius Diodati (see BACONIANA, 1679) made an extended visit to England and incidentally instructed Rawley to prepare a Latin edition of Bacon's acknowledged writings.

Coincidentally with Diodati's visit were printed the 1632 "Shakespeare" Folio, the 1632 folio "Anatomy of Melancholy," corrected and having an engraved frontispiece by C. le Blon, the 1632 folio "Montaigne" (Florio) with a remarkable engraved frontispiece by Droeshout, the "Six Court Comedies" and a new edition of Bacon's "Essays."

What was Diodati doing in this country unless he was publishing agent for an author who in privacy abroad had finished off and re-edited literary work to which he attached importance?

Mr. Looney thinks the Chettle reference to "Melicert" to have meant Earl Oxford.

The value of the letters in "Melicert" is 81, that mysterious number indicated by B.I on the first page of the Shakespeare Folio at foot of the verse to the Reader, and under all the engraved portraits of Bacon.

---

#### "THE GREATEST OF LITERARY PROBLEMS."

By the Hon. Phinney Baxter.

This book is now alas! out of print, but it will still, of course, be in libraries, and attention is called to it as a valuable and comprehensive storehouse of Baconian information.

---

An Index to Contents of "Baconiana" for August '19, March '20, and March '21 (Nos. 61, 2, 3 of Third Series) is being printed, and will be supplied by Messrs. Gay & Hancock, 34, Henrietta Street, London, W.C.2, on application, price 1/-.

## NOTES AND NOTICES.

The annual luncheon of the Bacon Society, in commemoration of the birthday of Francis Bacon, took place at Jule's Restaurant, Piccadilly, on January 23rd last. There was a larger attendance than usual. Sir John Cockburn (the President) presided, supported at the head of the table by Lady Durning-Lawrence and Miss Durning-Lawrence, Dr. Robinson, and other well-known members. Excellent speeches were made by Sir John, Mr. Granville C. Cuninghame, General Hickson, Mr. E. F. Udny (Hon. Secretary), Miss Alicia Leith, Captain Gundry, and Mr. Henry Seymour. Mr. Horace Nickson (President of the Warwickshire Bacon Society) and Mrs. Hickson were also present. Miss Lucy Dart delighted the company with a fine old traditional song, accompanied on the pianoforte by Miss Ramsden. Many wrote expressing regret that they were unable to be present on account of illness.

The Literary Committee has now completed its labours for the reproduction of the original edition of "Love's Labour's Lost" in *facsimile*, with an Introduction, annotations and appendices, which bring together a mass of historical, biographical, bibliographical and other material in support of the thesis that this play (the first to bear the ascription of "W. Shakespere") was written by Francis Bacon. The publication of this work will constitute a very important addition to Bacon literature.

The Council is seriously considering a proposal by Mr. Seymour which has for its object the stimulation of

a wider interest in the Bacon movement by a session of lectures and discussions, at monthly intervals, to take place at one of the available lecture halls, from September to April in each year. By such means, our literature might be made more accessible to the general public ; and although it may be too late to embark on such a project until the autumn, now that the long evenings are approaching, it is felt that the experiment is worth a trial, and that, with energetic organization and co-operation, it might become a fruitful branch of the Society's activity.

The lantern lecture by Mr. Topham Forrest, F.R.I.B.A. (Chief Architect to the London County Council), delivered on March 3rd at the Birkbeck College, was very interesting, the subject being " Early London Theatres with which Shakespeare was associated." Sir Sidney Lee presided, and there was a full attendance. The projected views of several of the Elizabethan theatres (chiefly exteriors) were copied from rare prints of the period. The only picture extant of an *interior* was shown as that of the " Old Swan." The County Council is doing good work in promoting research in these matters. The lecturer's " conjectural " plan, sectional, and elevation drawings, showing both the interior as well as the exterior of the Globe Theatre, constructed from many available links of evidence and supplemented by the imagination on well-reasoned lines, displayed no mean ability, as well as zeal. But when he departed from his professional province and essayed to set up conjectural hypotheses about the Stratford man of straw's ability as a scholar, and coolly contended that he was *probably* a schoolmaster in his youth, he became humorous. We had heard of this blessed adverb before.

" The Bacon Society of America " is about to be incorporated and amplified under the direction of

Mr. Willard Parker. We rejoice that an active propaganda is to be commenced "across the seas," and wish the enterprise all the success which it deserves. The early publication of the following books is already announced: "Francis Bacon, the Last of the Tudors," by Anna Deventer v. Kunow of Weiner (translated by Willard Parker); "The Sonnets of Francis Bacon Tudor Shakespeare," with commentary, by Willard Parker; and "A Study of 'The Tempest'" (a posthumous work by Edwin Reed). Others are also in course of preparation. The address of the Society is 764, Woolworth Building, New York City, N.Y., and the President's office is at Conshohocken, Pa., U.S.A.

Attention is directed to a rather lengthy letter by Herr Weber in this issue, which, by an oversight, was omitted from the last. Instead, a reply by Mr. Parker Woodward, also in type, was inadvertently published by itself. The editors desire to express to Herr Weber their sincere regrets that so unfortunate a circumstance should have arisen.

At the Gosforth Adult School, recently, Mr. Michael Storey gave an admirable sketch of the characters of Bacon and "Shakespeare." By numerous parallels and coincidences he claimed that the writer of the Shakespeare Plays was Lord Bacon; that both were one and the same man. William Shakspeare, of Stratford-on-Avon, was merely an illiterate play-actor, whose name was used by Bacon as a *nom de plume*. The school, having several members who are students of Shakespeare, put many questions to Mr. Storey, and an animated discussion ensued. It was generally agreed that it was only possible to speculate as to authorship, but the great fact, that the master-work was handed down to us with all its greatness, truth, and beauty, remained



## REVIEWS.

"TO MARGUERITE." A song attributed to Francis Bacon, and set to music by Henry Seymour. Edwin Ashdown, Ltd., publishers, 19, Hanover Square, London, W. 2s. net.

A charming production, whose attractive Elizabethan exterior, designed by the well-known artist, Mr. Chas. E. Dawson, will arrest attention. The "Biographical Foreword" tells us that this song was written by Bacon in his youth, and that the subject thereof was the celebrated Margaret de Valois, with whom he was passionately in love. The song has two stanzas, and the first of these is to be found in the comedy, "Measure for Measure." An excellently-tinted reproduction of the Hilliard miniature of Bacon at 18 adorns the title-page, as well as some ingenious cypher indications, which suggest it as a useful device for propaganda in a new field. The words of the song have a plaintive air, while its simple setting is reminiscent of Elizabethan music.

J. W. C. RAWLEY.

---

### "BEN JONSON AND SIR SIDNEY LEE."

We have to thank Mr. J. Denham Parsons for above, and two other essays. Mr. Parsons shows evidence of "sub-surface" signalling in the last dedicatory process in the Shakespeare Folio Plays, and is offended that Lee, to whom he referred his "find," was hostile, and he thinks unfair. We think he would have wisely let the Stratfordians alone. They are not out to learn, but to bolster up the myth which has illuded them.

We trust Mr. Parsons will persevere with his study, as it is more than likely the "J. M." poem is a key to some captured communication. James Mabbe is alleged to be the author of the poem. He it was who is said to have "translated" the "Poclus exemplares" of the assumed author Cervantes into English. If Mr. Parsons will examine it again he should see that it has 64 words, and so equals the chess-board squares. He must ignore the hyphens. "Shake" "speare," "Graves," "Tyring," "roome," "Worlds," "Stage," count as separate words. "That's" is two words. It is probable that the Epilogue to the "Tempest," is the key to a capital letter cypher.

P. W.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### THE CYPHER-STORY.

#### TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

SIRS,—In *Baconiana* (March, 1920) Mr. Parker Woodward writes :—" It has become convenient for many persons to ignore and discredit Mrs. Gallup, and the story told in biliteral cypher. I do not share that attitude, and am satisfied the biliteral story has been on the whole correctly and certainly honestly deciphered."

Mr. Parker Woodward continues on page 11 : . . . . .  
"that in the 1635 edition has been deciphered and contains the blunder about Davison which caused considerable comment when Mrs. Gallup printed her decipher. I regard it as just one of those failures of memory which often occur in an overcrowded brain. Davison's life was declared forfeit, but he was as a fact, let off. Bacon must be excused. He did not even remember where the remains of his foster mother, Lady Ann Bacon, had been laid to rest."

May I be allowed to present the following objections to these observations of Mr. Parker Woodward, for whom I, as a Baconian student, have the greatest consideration ? Davison's life was never declared forfeit, as is told in the " Biliteral Cypher " by Mrs. Gallup.

Mrs. Gallup describes in her " Cypher " the interview between Burleigh and Leicester,

to which was summoned the Queen's Secretary, who was so threatened by his lordship—on paine of death, et cetera, —that he sign'd for the Queen, and affixed the great seale to the dreadful death-warrant. *The life of the secretary was forfeit* to the deed when her Majesty became aware that so daring a crime had become committed, but who shall say that *the blow fell upon the guilty head*, for truth to say, Davison was only a feeble instrument in their hands, and life seemed in th' balance, therefore blame doth fall on those men, great and noble though they be, *who led him to his death.*"

This whole tale of Davison's execution, contained in Mrs.

Gallup's " Biliteral cypher " is, as is generally acknowledged, quite unhistoric. Never did Davison sign the death-warrant for the Queen and never was his life for such a crime forfeit, nor was he executed. Davison refused to sign the condemnation at all and absolutely refused to do so. All the details of the signing of the death warrant are well known by a very extensive literature and are in direct contradiction to the " Biliteral Cypher " of Mrs. Gallup.

" He was " (according to Lingard's History of England) " condemned to a fine of ten thousand marks, and to be imprisoned during the royal pleasure. The treasury seized all his property, so that *at his release from confinement in 1589* he found himself reduced to a state of extreme indigence. The Queen, though she lived seventeen years longer, *would never restore him to favour. He was still her secretary, but not allowed to exercise the office.* Even the young Earl of Essex, in the zenith of his influence, prayed for Davison in vain. Perhaps she deemed him unworthy of pardon, *because he would not plead guilty*: perhaps she thought by this severity to convince the world that she did not dissemble."

In one of the many letters addressed to Davison, and published in the " Cabala " the Earl of Essex writes :—

" I told her " (the Queen) " how many friends and well-wishers the world did afford you ; and how for the most part, throughout the whole Realm her best subjects did wish that she would do herself the honour to repaire for you, and restore to you that state, which she had overthrown."

On April 18th, 1589, Essex wrote a letter to the King James of Scotland, imploring his help to restore Davison in his position as Secretary of the Queen. In this letter he writes :—

" I would assure your Majesty, you would get great honour and great love, not only here amongst us, but in all places of Christendom where this gentleman (Davison) is anything known, if you should now be the author of his restoring to his place, *which in effect he now is, but as a man not acceptable to her Majesty, he doth forbear to attend.*"

Davison lived, as is proved beyond any doubt, *twenty-one years*

after the death of the Queen of Scots, and *then died peacefully* in his house.

All this must, of course, have been very well known to Bacon, and he therefore never could have written the account of the biliteral story, that in every line and nearly every word contradicts generally known historical facts.

The Cypher-Account that Davison was threatened by Burleigh and Leicester, *on pain of death, et cetera* (!) to sign for the Queen, besides the contrary being historically proved, is quite impossible by many interior motives and has only the fable of the killing of the Queen by the hands of Robert Cecil a parallel.

A "failure of memory" on the part of Bacon, as Mr. Parker Woodward supposes, is, under these circumstances, quite excluded, having regard to the famous "*most exquisite brain*" that Bacon possessed, and his phenomenal and systematically trained memory.

It is really amusing in what an easy manner Mr. Baxter\* helps himself in this difficulty. He writes (page 551) :

"A critical examination, however, of the cypher story does not conflict with this. A correction of a *slight error*, a change of 'his' for 'her' before the last word, so as to read '*her death*' sets the matter right." (!)

I am not able to consider this funny rope-dancing of Mr. Baxter's as a "*critical examination*" and a "*correcting of a slight error*," and don't think this "*slight correction*" effects a great change of the concerned part of the "Biliteral cypher."

This supposed "*correcting*" is not to be taken in earnest, and reminds me of the methods found so often in Stratfordian books, especially in the so-called "*Life of Shakespeare*" of Sir Sidney Lee, in the books of Gollancz, Robertson, Brandes, and others of the Stratfordian stars. Shall we begin to accept Stratfordian methods, after having fought them so long?

If Mr. Parker-Woodward writes "*Bacon must be excused*," I have to answer, that there is nothing to be excused, for Bacon never could have written such an impossible account; and also he *remembered very well where the remains of his foster-mother, Lady Ann Bacon, had been laid to rest*: and if he wrote the mentioned passage in his last will it is in effect no other

---

\* "The Greatest of Literary Problems," Boston, 1915. Now out of print.



than the known words : " *Unmarried she (Elizabeth) lived and left no issue.*"

He, with good motives, took care to declare in his will in a solemn way, that he considered himself *not as Francis Tudor, the son of Elizabeth*, but as the loving son of the Lady Ann Bacon.

The question of the tomb in Saint Albans was for him only a fit occasion to allude to his foster-mother in a manner well-known from his "*Felicities of Queen Elizabeth.*" His intimate friends know very well, what they have to do with his love to Lady Ann, for whom Bacon did not care very much in the last ten years of her life, at least, not as much as a natural son would certainly have done.

Under these circumstances it is indeed justifiable to ignore the "Bilateral cypher," which leads to so impossible results; "*discredited*" is this so-called "*Cypher*" or "*Cyphar*" by itself, so that for "*many persons*" there is no further work to do on this behalf.

If Mr. Parker-Woodward does not share that attitude, I am ready to enter into a discussion on this subject and send for this purpose a paper to *Baconiana*, expounding the motives by which I am led to think that *the Baconian Theory and the true story of the Life of Francis Tudor-Bacon does not want a cypher at all* to be understood, as I explain this clearly in my books, "*Bacon-Shakespeare-Cervantes*" and "*Der wahre Shakespeare.*"

The knowledge of Bacon is founded on the secure ground of history and literature, whether it may, perhaps, in the future be attested by any cypher or not. More probable than the bilateral cypher is the arithmetical cypher in Bacon's works, as the late Sir Durning Lawrence, Professor Dr. H. A. W. Speckman, in Arnheim (Holland) and others clearly show.

As to the bilateral cypher, it is indeed not very probable that Bacon would use in his works a cypher, to which he publishes himself the key in such an ostentatious manner, as he does in "*De Augmentis*" (1623). Probably he intended to lead the attention of his readers to other cyphers in his works, of which the keys are to be found in Gustavus Selenus (1623) and other cryptographical books.

I consider the "*Cypher Story*" of Donnelly, Dr. Owen, and Mrs. Gallup as a great error, and doing serious damage to the Baconian science, being a dangerous weapon in the



hands of the Stratfordians who have accepted the tactic to identify the Bacon theory with the Gallup cypher.

In the interest of the Baconian science it is necessary to open a discussion upon this subject, and I hope BACONIANA will be really open for the expression of all shades of opinion, although they may not be in accord with the opinions of certain highly respected and honourable members of the Council of the Bacon Society.

A free tribune for any opinion is indispensable for true science, that is not to *support any dogma, be it of Stratfordian or Cypher sort.*

I have strong proofs that there is a great error in the biliteral and the word-cyphers of the above-mentioned authors, which are the result of a very interesting and not quite unsympathetic delusion, often found in the history of the development of human knowledge, a delusion produced by an abounding fancy, and the enthusiastic zeal to find the truth for the benefit of mankind ; a zeal which does not at all touch the well-meaning and the honesty of the would-be "decipherers."

I hope, dear sirs, that you will give me the opportunity to explain myself further in this matter, and remain, with kind regards,

Yours obediently,

ALFRED WEBER.

6th June, 1920.

Address: Hofrath Alfred Weber (Ebenhof), Vienna (Austria)  
X. Valeriestrasse 44.

#### TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

Hampstead.

DEAR EDITORS,—I came across, lately, a book called *Moated Houses* by Outram Tristram, and found, I think, a clue to the sleep-walking scene in *Macbeth*. Francis Bacon's Aunt Elizabeth Cook married Thomas Hoby in 1558. They lived in Bisham Abbey, Berkshire; once a Preceptory of Knights Templar, and the abode of Crusaders in Stephen's time. Tristram says that hanging in the dining room is a portrait of Lady Hoby in coif and weeds, with a ghostly white face. She is said to have beaten a child to death because he could not write a line in his copy-book without blotting it; that about seventy-nine years ago a copy book, wofully blotted, was

found thrust between the joists of a room in Bisham, and that Lady Hoby is said to haunt Bisham, washing her hands with a basin before her. Severity was a fashion with parents and guardians in her time. Her sister, Lady Bacon, requested Whitgift not to spare the rod when her boys, Anthony and Francis, went to Cambridge; and Lady Hoby might have threatened a delicate boy with a birch or cane and caused his death from fright, rather than have gone the lengths of beating him to death, the shock of which sad event might have resulted in her walking in her sleep and trying to wash her hands from the stains of blood after an all unpremeditated deed. She would hardly have won the affections of Lord John Russell whom she married after a year or two of widowhood had she been a very Lady Macbeth. Did Francis Bacon obtain his famous sleep-walking scene from his autocratic relative's mental disturbances at Bisham? It will be remembered that Lady Russell entertained Queen Elizabeth at dinner at her house at Blackfriars in 1600, on the occasion of her daughter Anne marrying Lord Worcester's son. The frontispiece of Shakespeare's *England* presents Elizabeth on her way to Lady Russell's house in a gold Lectita, with Francis Bacon's face brought into prominence by a black hat, the only one in the picture, framing it in. The picture is by Geerhardt. That Francis was intimate with the family is seen by a kind but rather pathetic letter written by him to his cousin Posthumus Hoby, Lady Hoby's son, to thank him for congratulations on his marriage. "Your loving congratulations for my doubled life, as you call it, I thank you for. No man may better conceive the joys of a good wife than yourself with whom I dare not compare." It is worth noting that the very interesting *Diary of an Elizabethan Gentlewoman* (Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Third Series, Vol. II.) written by Margaret, Lady Hoby, the wife of Posthumus Hoby, and the subject of Francis Bacon's admiration as a "good wife," never mentions him or his. "Aunt Cook" and Lady Burleigh are mentioned, but Lady Bacon and famous Francis have no place whatever in the Diary. The omission is so extraordinary that it behoves me to mention it.—Yours faithfully,

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

---

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

SIRS,—A book by A. R. Orage, "Readers and Writers, 1917-1921," has just been published by Allen and Unwin (7s. 6d.) The author says that "English literary criticism lies under the disgrace of accepting Shakespeare, the tenth-rate



player, as Shakespeare the divine author, and so long as a mistake of this magnitude is admitted into the canon, nobody of any perception can treat the canon with respect."

"The Nation and Athenæum" is furious about this rebuke, and trots out Ben Jonson as "a tenth-rate player" who was also a great author. Its brilliant critic overlooks the fact that Ben Jonson was educated at Westminster under one of the most laborious and many-sided of Elizabethan scholars, Camden, and that everything Ben Jonson wrote is in accordance with his education and experience, but in Shakespeare's case "in wide contrast."

Mr. Orage is the distinguished editor of "The New Age."—  
Yours sincerely,

R. L. EAGLE.

---

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

SIRS,—Dr. Whewell, the author of "The History of the Inductive Sciences," writing of Friar Roger Bacon and his work, said: "It is difficult to conceive how such a character could then exist," and referring to the Friar's great work, the "Opus Magus," I regard the existence of such a work at that period as a problem that has never been solved."

Friar Bacon is credited with the invention of the telescope, microscope, gunpowder and even the phonograph.

NOAH MOULE.

26th April, 1922.

---

TO THE EDITORS OF "BACONIANA."

SIRS,—The writer recently saw an engraving by Hollar which depicted a bust of Charles II. supported on one side by the figure of John Evelyn, and on the other by that of *Francis Bacon*. Why Bacon should thus appear is a little difficult to explain when one considers the fact that he died in 1626 and Charles II. was not born until 1630.

It is not without interest to remember that Lord Clarendon was the next Lord Chancellor after Bacon, the intervening heads of the judiciary being only Lord's Keeper.

Charles II. appointed Clarendon Lord Chancellor in 1658, while in exile, the appointment being confirmed on the restoration of that monarch.

NOAH MOULE.

26th April, 1922.

---

THE STRATFORD "BIRTHPLACE."

There is no evidence whatever save by a very late tradition of John Shakespeare's occupation of the Western House, commonly called "The Birthplace," before his purchase of it in 1575."—*Notes and Queries*, 20th October, 1920.